NRA MEMBER U.S. WE DO OUR PART

The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXXXVII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1933 No. 3564

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 467
EDITORIALS:
Organized Labor Stands Pat 470
Illness and Idleness 471
The Case of Mr. McKee 472
Broadway Looks Up 472
ISSUES AND MEN. TWO AMERICANS: HILLQUIT AND ADLER. By Oswald Garrison Villard 473
LaGUARDIA VERSUS McKEE. By Paul Blanshard 474
THE SUPPRESSED ADVERTISEMENT CONCERNING R. H. MACY 478
AIRING THE AIRSHIP. By S. Fitz-Randolph and H. Phillips . . 480
ILLNESS AND RECOVERY. By Paul Y. Anderson 481
WHY FORD WORKERS STRIKE. By Carl M. Mydans 482
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 483
CORRESPONDENCE 484
FINANCE. WALL STREET AT THE WAILING WALL. By Peter Helmoop Noyes 485
BOOKS, FILMS, DRAMA:
A Dialogue of Self and Soul. By W. B. Yeats 487
American Politics. By H. L. Mencken 487
Ruskin: A Career of Error. By Lionel Trilling 488
The Swiss Family Borsodi. By Catherine Bauer 489
A Blithe Disciple. By Alice Beal Parsons 491
Shorter Notices 492
Films: "Night Flight." By William Troy 492
Drama: In Praise of Bundling. By Joseph Wood Krutch 493
CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE 494

BOARD OF EDITORS
ERNEST GRUENING FREDA KIRCHWEY
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH
ASSOCIATE EDITORS
MAURITZ A. HALLGREN MARGARET MARSHALL
DOROTHY VAN DOREN

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States; to Canada, $5.50; and to other foreign countries, $6.00.

THE NATION, No. 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Muriel C. Gray, Advertising Manager. British Agent, Gertrude M. Cross, 23 Brunswick Square, London W. C. 1, England.

THE PEACE OF EUROPE, having been planted on top of a handsome sowing of dragon's teeth in the form of the Treaty of Versailles, is now threatened by exactly the crop of bitter fighting men that might have been looked for. That much of Chancellor Hitler's speech explaining why Germany was withdrawing from the League of Nations and from the Disarmament Conference can be granted him: a bad war was ended by a bad peace, and Europe learned nothing from either, although prior to the establishment of the Hitler Government the sympathy of the world was inclining more and more toward the Germans. But to dissociate Germany summarily from the only existing attempt to improve matters is the work of an insane and dangerous egotist. France has already repudiated Hitler's attempt to create a Franco-German bloc against England; England, it is predicted, will firmly oppose any suggestions for reduction of armament; Italy talks of a rapprochement of nations without Germany. It is true that Hitler insisted on Germany's ultimate desire for peace and disarmament, should the rest of Europe agree; it is true that Italy is taking the German withdrawal with "maximum calm" and emphasizes those portions of Hitler's speech which urged amity among all nations. In spite of all this official dispassion, in spite of all this talk of peace, the cloud of war hangs thick over Europe. In Austria barbed wire is being strung along the frontiers; in every country of Europe except censored Germany the word "war" is being shrieked or whispered, either one with telling effect. The Disarmament Conference, already on the rocks, is admittedly lost, in spite of Arthur Henderson's adjurations to carry on. It has adjourned until October 26. A fortnight after that come the German elections, when every German is to be permitted to approve of the Nazi foreign policy—and God help him if he refuses! Meanwhile Europe waits.

IT is at least encouraging to note that the French government is not too much disturbed, although it sees clearly enough that in the conciliatory phrases toward France in his speech Hitler was trying to drive a wedge between it and the other Allies, especially England. There is no clamor in France for a reoccupation of Germany and little excuse for it in any act of the Reich thus far. Indeed, with the exception of propaganda in Austria and Schleswig and the various border incidents which may kindle the European powder keg, Teuton fury to date has spent itself chiefly internally. The main cause of friction has been attacks upon foreigners in Germany, generally for failure to salute the Nazi flag. For these occurrences Germany has been officially regretful, and has just arrested, in response to most emphatic protests, the assailants of Roland Velz, the latest American victim of Nazi ruffianism, although dispatches point out that no storm trooper has been punished so far in consequence of attacks on foreigners. If German violence could be confined to Germany, there might be no disruption of the peace of Europe. Foreigners would learn that they entered Germany at their own risk. The outside world has far more effective means of influencing events than military aggression. The circle of moral disapproval and economic pressure is tightening about the Reich. The resolution of the American Federation of Labor recommending a boycott of German industry commits to that policy the largest organization that has so far spoken in this country. It may be argued that the censorship permits nobody in Germany to know of it. But the censorship cannot restrain the effect of the boycott upon Germany's economic life, and that, in turn, cannot be concealed from the German public now any more than could the country's desperate industrial plight during the World War.

WHILE EUROPE IS SHIVERING under the blow dealt it by Germany's withdrawal from the League, Japan and Russia are continuing their contentious negotiations over the Chinese Eastern Railway. *Izvestia* and *Pravda* have both carried articles protesting alleged official documents proposing seizure of the railway by the Japanese. Japan's comment in reply varies from indignation to the soft answer which is evidently designed to smooth the incident over. But two Soviet officials, recently appointed to posts on the railway, have been summarily removed by the Japanese authorities, and the Soviets have not failed to protest this action also. It is plain that there is considerable tension be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween the two governments, and the newspaper editorials in Moscow merely give warning that Russia will not take too many affronts lying down. *Izvestia* says frankly: "It is therefore quite clear that the plan for seizure of the Chinese Eastern is the plan of the Japanese government and that all responsibility for working out this plan . . . and for the consequences rests wholly upon the Japanese government." Japan's answer may very well be fortified by Hitler's withdrawal from the Disarmament Conference and the League. German animosity in general has been directed against Russia and not in the least against Japan, and Germany now joins Japan in having repudiated the League and all its works. It is not too much to say, probably, that as a result of the German decision, Japan and Germany are closer together than ever, and Russia is farther from either. Which not inconceivably makes Russia nearer to the rest of the world.

IT'S A LONG WAY from Broadway to Bechuanaland, but the jump is worth making to consider the banishment and return of Tshekedi, the native chieftain. Although Tshekedi's authority extends only among his Bamangwato tribesmen, and not to Europeans, he tried a white settler and sentenced him to be flogged for offenses against native women. For this the chieftain was banished by the British High Commissioner of the protectorate after a spectacular trial. But the banishment aroused much criticism among European elements in South Africa, especially among the missionaries, who contended that the flogged man had got what was coming to him. Hence London recently ordered Tshekedi's reinstatement. The significance of the incident lies in its revelation of changing conditions. A quarter of a century ago neither of the major events would have been dreamed of in a region under British rule. The flogging of a European by order of a native would have been almost inconceivable, and had it occurred, the continuance in office of the man responsible for it would have been impossible. But Britain's far-flung line of world imperialism has had to give way. The "white man's burden" has been x-rayed and found to be mostly a moral justification for commercial greed—a rationalization of the need of a hard-pressed capitalist industrialism to exploit the last corners of the world. Not only have the "lesser breeds" revolted against Kipling's phrase but those for whom the creed was written no longer believe it either. The doctrine of the "white man's burden" and the industrial system which it sought to justify have both been crumpled by the march of events.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT and Secretary of State Hull should be warmly commended for having changed the attitude of the United States with regard to the appointment of a Chief Adviser to Liberia under the plan of assistance of the League of Nations. The Firestone interests, supported by the permanent officials of the State Department, had insisted that the adviser be an American citizen. At the meeting of the League of Nations committee at Geneva by which the plan of assistance is being put into final form, the Liberian representative strongly opposed this course. The reasons for this opposition were explained by Mauritz A. Hallgren in our issue of August 16. They are, briefly, that the State Department in 1926 forced upon Liberia a loan it did not want, whose interest payments—at 7 per cent—it has been unable to meet, and that the League plan of assistance for Liberia is in reality the State Department's plan for collecting the loan. This plan, which bristles with provisions for "foreign experts," would not only deprive Liberia of its administrative autonomy but also seriously reduce such essential public services as education and health in order to guarantee the disproportionate salaries of the unwanted "experts." When, finally, one reads Firestone interests for State Department, Liberia's opposition becomes doubly understandable. It appears that neither President Roosevelt nor Secretary Hull, both of whom have been busy with other and more pressing matters, was fully aware of the implications of the proposal that an American be named. When the situation was fully described to these officials, they acted promptly, and in consequence General Blanton Winship, the American member of the committee, was able to reply to the Liberian delegate that the United States would not oppose the appointment of an adviser from a disinterested country.

SPAIN, the youngest republic in the Old World, has recognized the administration of Grau San Martin in Cuba. This is now in its sixth week, having already exhibited double the longevity of its predecessor, the Cespedes Government. True, reports emanate from Cuba that the government is not representative, that the students number only a few thousand, that they are young and irresponsible, that the army represents only itself, that President Grau is but a puppet of both. Granting that all this were so, is it the function of the United States to sit by until just the government we think "right" is shaken out of the dice-box of chance? We helped instal a most "representative" government and gave it our blessing. It vanished before the crude realities of revolution. Are we so old and distant from the days of our national beginnings that we cannot understand the genuine youthful stirrings in the republic to which we are so closely attached by history, proximity, and circumstance? Howard Brubaker, in his pithy column in the *New Yorker,* remarks pointedly: "There is another difference between Cuban and American folkways. Havana students are running the government while ours are curled up with copies of Kipling's 'If.'"

ONE of the immediate results of the Administration's intrusion in the New York City election has been the sabotaging of the Senate investigation of investment banking. Valuable as were the revelations brought out by the examinations of the house of Morgan and of "old Doctor Kuhn, Loeb," it is no secret that the probing might have been deeper and more productive. Ferdinand Pecora, counsel for the Banking and Currency Committee, at first unfamiliar with the intricacies of finance, was presumably gathering wisdom as he proceeded. The division of his interest by his candidacy for the district attorneyship of New York on the McKee ticket has, however, already become manifest. The investigation of Dillon, Read and Company was superficial and hasty. It barely scratched the surface. There is, to be sure, distinct value in the cumulative evidence of enormous bankers' profits, of evasion of tax payments through the legalistic loopholes of the income-tax law, of "rigging the market" for the sale of dubious offerings, of none too great solicitude for the safety and soundness of the securities sold the public, and of the involvement of men highly placed in public office or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in private life through loans or membership on preferred lists. But the story of high finance and of the leadership which dominated America to its cost in the Dizzy Decade is too important to be slighted. The information which is obtained may form the basis for remedial legislation. The Chase National Bank is to be investigated next, and it is an open secret that the preparation for this inquiry is sketchy and inadequate. The banking fraternity is quietly rejoicing. Thus President Roosevelt's Man Farley has done the Administration and the country a double disservice. He has injured or at least imperiled the prospect of a New Deal on two fronts.

AN INVESTIGATION hardly less important than that of the Senate banking inquiry has been under way in the District of Columbia for several weeks. It has had no nation-wide publicity, although it has exposed conditions relative to the concentration of wealth and industrial control which affect the interests of virtually all Americans. This is the milk-trust investigation undertaken by the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate. It began simply as an inquiry into high milk prices in the city of Washington, but thanks primarily to the vigor and dogged persistence of the committee's investigator, Elwood Seal, it has led to the exposure of the curious methods whereby the National Dairy Products Corporation grew within the space of a few years from a small company owning six or seven small dairies to the largest milk trust in the world. In every case in which dairies or milk-distributing firms have been absorbed by the trust, with the exception of two small companies, the corporation paid for the properties purchased not in cash or out of its own resources but by issuing stock. After examining the books and questioning the treasurer of the corporation, Mr. Seal declared that these stock sales appeared on their face "to show watered-stock operations in all subsidiaries acquired by National Dairy." The Senate committee is mainly interested in the manner in which the trust brought most of the dairy farmers in the rural districts adjacent to Washington under its thumb, as well as in the methods whereby the corporation acquired control of the two largest milk-distributing companies in the capital. But so important is this inquiry to the country as a whole that the Senate, upon reconvening, should act immediately to widen its scope.

THE California Council on Oriental Relations reports a most encouraging change in sentiment on the Pacific Coast in regard to the 1924 immigration law. Composed of some forty-five outstanding citizens of the State the council has now drawn 3,000 representative leaders of opinion into cooperation with it, among them the presidents of the three largest universities in California; municipal, county, and State officials; manufacturers, business, and professional men; and agriculturalists throughout the State. The object of the council is to bring about the amendment of the law so that Japan and China will be put upon the same footing as the other countries of the world, whereas their nationals are now discriminated against by being completely excluded and not given the benefit of the quota plan. Not only does the report itself indicate a great change in public sentiment in California, but there is much additional evidence in the favorable attitude of the press of the State, with the exception of the Hearst newspapers. Thus, the San Francisco *News* admits that the act of 1924 is a "gratuitous insult to Japan" and that the Pacific Coast carries a heavy responsibility for this injustice to the Japanese and Chinese. "The sooner the exclusion act is replaced, the better for international relations," says the San Francisco *Chronicle,* pointing out at the same time that putting Japan and China upon a quota basis means only the admission of the horrendous number of 185 Japanese and 105 Chinese a year. The California State Chamber of Commerce, to its great credit, is leading the fight. It is, of course, true that the profit motive is partly behind the chamber's move. Our Asiatic trade has risen from $125,000,000 in 1913 to something over $2,000,000,000 today.

WITHOUT BEING VINDICTIVE, one may nevertheless rejoice at the speedy disposal of the Urschel kidnapping case by the Department of Justice. Within a period of ninety days from July 22, when Charles F. Urschel, the rich oil man of Oklahoma City, was urged from his home at the point of a gun, the money paid by the Urschel family was recovered, the kidnapping gang was apprehended, and six of them began life sentences in various federal penitentiaries. After a series of kidnappings in which nothing much happened except that the kidnappers received the swag and returned the victim, it is heartening to know that it is apparently not impossible to punish this type of criminal with the restraint he deserves. If this is the result of federal participation in the apprehension of such criminals, then one can be grateful for the law that made such participation possible. Kidnapping was distinctly assuming the proportions of a successful racket in which the rewards were large and the hazards few. Since it is obviously impossible to keep the families of victims from doing everything in their power to bring about the return of the kidnapped person, even though this includes paying ransom money in large sums and keeping quiet, and since local police to date have been unable in most cases to find the kidnappers, one can be grateful for the competence and incorruptibility of federal officers, who may thus add to their long list of successful prosecutions of counterfeiters and mail robbers the successful prosecution of the lowest criminal of them all.

GEORGE CRAWFORD, Negro, under indictment for the murder of Mrs. Agnes Boeing Ilsley and her maid, must go back to Virginia for trial. The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that the issue raised by Judge James A. Lowell, that Negroes did not serve on grand juries in Virginia, is not valid in habeas corpus proceedings. The Circuit Court of Appeals had previously reversed Judge Lowell, and its decision is now sustained by the highest tribunal in the land. An enormous service, however, has been rendered by Judge Lowell. The issue has been brought into the open. The eyes of the nation will be focused on Virginia, where the probability of a fair trial for Crawford is greatly enhanced. The publicizing of the racial discrimination in the omission of colored jurors has already brought some reform in that State. The Supreme Court's reversal of Judge Lowell's decision was essentially on technical grounds and does not at all preclude, should Crawford be found guilty, an appeal to the Supreme Court on the issue that a man is not being tried by a jury of his peers if members of his race are excluded therefrom.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Organized Labor Stands Pat

THE American Federation of Labor has elected to cling to its rutted conservatism for yet another year. By deciding to continue to support the principle of craft unionism it has said in effect that what was good enough for Samuel Gompers and the rebels of the Cigar Makers' Union fifty years ago is still good enough for the labor movement of today. And it adheres to this policy despite the fact that the working class in general and the A. F. of L. in particular would be immeasurably strengthened if the craft union were scrapped in favor of the industrial union.

For those of *The Nation's* readers who are not acquainted with the terminology of the labor movement, let it be said that craft unionism divides the organized workers according to their special trades or crafts. Thus a bricklayer, a carpenter, and a plumber, though all three are working on the same construction job, belong to different unions. Industrial unionism, on the other hand, puts all the workers in a given industry into the same union. The former type of organization is sometimes known as the horizontal union and the latter as the vertical union.

While the fight between craft and industrial unionism has taken on new importance and has perhaps for the first time found real public interest as a result of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the fight itself is by no means new. Indeed, the federation was born largely in consequence of the struggle between these two opposing schools of thought. The Knights of Labor believed in and fought for the industrial union. The A. F. of L., composed primarily of autonomous craft unions that had broken away from the Noble Order of the Knights of Labor, naturally supported horizontal unionism. The skilled workers, who at best were never very enthusiastic over, as one student has put it, "a program calling for the 'uplift' of the great mass of unskilled laborers," were won over to the A. F. of L., leaving the Knights of Labor with no foundation upon which to build.

But it must not be supposed that all the local, national, or international bodies affiliated with the A. F. of L. are autonomous craft unions. Some are so-called "federal" unions, whose affairs are completely under the control of the federation; others are mixed-craft unions; and still others almost pure industrial unions. In the latter category belongs the United Mine Workers of America, the fastest-growing and one of the largest unions in the country today. Nevertheless, the A. F. of L. has always stood faithfully by the principle of craft unionism. Though there has been a strong minority within the organization which has long advocated the reorganization of labor along industrial or vertical lines, this element has invariably been voted down.

What has craft unionism meant for the labor movement? It has departmentalized the movement, broken it up into cliques working at cross-purposes. It has resulted in almost complete failure to organize the semi-skilled and unskilled workers. With the need for skilled mechanics becoming relatively less as industry is rationalized and labor-saving machinery is introduced, the base upon which organized labor stands has inevitably become smaller in proportion to the working class as a whole. This has contributed to the decline of the A. F. of L. quite as much as has its stupid leadership. But organized labor has been hurt in other ways as well. For example, the steel strike of 1919 was lost largely because of the selfishness and narrowness of the interested craft unions. They competed with one another to organize the strikers instead of working together as they would have done had they been trying to establish a vertical union in the steel industry. In 1926 a plan was drawn up to organize the automobile workers. The seventeen craft unions involved, each of which claimed the right to organize one section or another of these workers, agreed to waive their jurisdictional privileges for the period of the campaign. But they insisted that once the automobile workers were organized they should be transferred to the respective craft unions. As a result of this petty jealousy the campaign was not even started.

Jurisdictional strikes, another product of craft unionism, have likewise proved costly to organized labor. They have dissipated the strength of the labor movement and have led to heavy wage losses. In such cases the members of a union strike not against the employers but against rival unions. There have been several such cases in connection with the government building program in Washington in the last few weeks. For example, more than a thousand workers were forced into idleness because the carpenters and iron workers took to quarreling over who should instal radiator covers in the Labor Department and Interstate Commerce buildings. The work to be done involved a total of no more than $800 in wages, but because of the strike other workers whose total pay roll amounted to more than $40,000 a week were laid off for a fortnight or longer. Another quarrel in the national capital involved the boiler-makers and iron workers. They could not agree on who should put up the smokestacks at the central heating plant, and in consequence work on this project was all but suspended. A third dispute concerned the bricklayers and asbestos workers, who argued for days over the question of which union should do the caulking around the window frames of one of the government buildings. There have also been cases in which craft unions have become strike-breaking organizations by siding with and doing "scab" work for employers engaged in disputes with rival unions.

Quite apart from the huge waste involved in these senseless jurisdictional strikes, it would seem especially necessary just now for organized labor to drop its craft unionism and swing to the vertical union because of the changed relationships among employers brought about by the NRA. Under the recovery laws the employers are being not only encouraged but actually compelled to form industry-wide trade associations. Thus all the employers in a given industry can and will present a solid front to labor. The workers, on the other hand, so long as craft unionism obtains, will be divided. Thus in negotiating with the workers the united employers can, as they have done in the past, play off one craft against another. Only through the industrial union, only by organizing all the workers in a single industry into a single union, can labor confront the solid front of the employers with a united front of its own. This seems so obvious that one is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amazed to learn that the A. F. of L. at its Washington convention again saw fit to reject the principle of industrial unionism.

The attitude of the federation officials can perhaps be explained. The skilled worker is interested more in his own day-to-day struggle than in the economic status of the working class as a whole. Just as in the seventies and eighties of the last century, he is still an individualist who sees in organization a means of improving his individual lot rather than a method of moving toward some remote workers' paradise. And when he decides to join a union he naturally prefers to be associated with members of his own craft. Another obstacle to industrial unionism is the salaried bureaucracy of the national and international unions. These officials feel, and certainly not without justification, that if the workers should be organized on industrial lines, the semi-skilled and unskilled laborers, through their overwhelming superiority in numbers, would capture control of the unions. These workers of lesser rank would inevitably tend to be more radical and would surely be opposed to the continued payment of munificent salaries to union officials. Industrial unionism would almost certainly smash the bureaucracy which now rules organized labor with an iron hand. More than that, it would be a means of preparing the whole working class to take over industry if and when the opportune moment should arrive. In short, it would be paving the way toward peaceful revolution. If industry should collapse under present conditions, with 90 per cent of the workers unorganized, only chaos and civil warfare or a tyrannical dictatorship could result.

Illness and Idleness

IT has been stated at several times and places, upon various authority, that the health of the American people has improved since the industrial depression and the large amount of unemployment associated with it. Although it would be easy to misinterpret statistics so as to reach that conclusion, the conclusion is not improbable. When, however, the conclusion is twisted—as it has been—to imply that health is better because of unemployment, or that it has improved among the unemployed, the conclusion becomes so improbable that it deserves to be rejected unless adequate and accurate data can be produced in its support. So far nothing of the kind has appeared, but unfortunately there has been little contrary material with which definitely to refute the theory. A study has just been made in New York City, however, by the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor which, although it covers only a small area, shows convincingly in so far as it goes that health suffers rather than benefits from unemployment when income depends upon having a job. Bailey B. Burritt, general director of the association, says in a foreword to the report:

> Much current discussion about health during the depression suffers from the fact, first, that it is based very largely on mortality data instead of morbidity data and, second, that it is based on data of the whole population, thus affording no opportunity to compare the health conditions of the unemployed part of the population with the employed part. There is every reason to believe that the health of the employed part of the population, or that part of the population having sufficient income to secure the necessities of life, is, on the whole, better during a depression period. The reason for this probability is obvious. Health, generally speaking, suffers more from the excesses of life than the restraints of life. Health is temporarily or permanently injured more by excessive eating, excessive drinking, unreasonable hours of sleep and rest than by restraints in these particulars. There has been some danger that the argument of the beneficial effects of a depression period upon families still having incomes, though perhaps impaired, would by implication be applied to families deprived of both employment and income.

The district studied is that served by the Mulberry Health Center, lying between Broadway and the Bowery and Bleecker and Canal streets. The population is one of low-paid industrial workers, dependent upon work for their livelihood. It is almost wholly of Italian stock, and thus presents an unusually homogeneous group in regard to susceptibility to disease. A survey of the district was made as far back as April, 1922. Another was made in November, 1930, and a third was conducted in April, 1932. A comparison and interpretation of all the information has now been published. There has been a great deal of unemployment in the district since the depression. The proportion of wage-earners who were unemployed was 11 per cent in April, 1922, 31 per cent in November, 1930, and 48 per cent in April, 1932. Also there was a definite increase in the amount of sickness in the district from the beginning of the depression to the spring of last year. In the autumn of 1930 sickness was reported in 24 per cent of the households, and in the spring of 1932 in 39 per cent of them.

But the findings go farther than merely to discover that there has been a striking decrease in employment and an increase in illness since the beginning of the depression. A direct relation between the two is also indicated. In nearly 2,000 households with one wage-earner in November, 1930, 14 per cent reported illness where the worker was employed as usual, 25 per cent where he was working less than usual, and 31 per cent where he was idle. It was found also that sickness was more prevalent in homes where the occupants had got behind in the rent—indicative of economic distress—than in those where payments were maintained. Thus in April, 1932, the sickness rate was 98 per thousand in households not in arrears with rent against 166 per thousand in homes where payments had fallen behind.

There are some exceptions to the general tendencies shown. Infectious diseases do not seem to have been influenced by the economic situation, and there is no conclusive evidence that the severity of sickness is increased by inadequate family support. Not all age groups are equally affected by employment status. The outstanding exception is the child between two and six years of age, which seems to be largely immune to the economic situation in the home. As for the rest, the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor says: "The evidence seems conclusive that in both April, 1932, and November, 1930, the unemployed portion of Mulberry's population suffered more sickness than the employed. This association persists after all cases in which *illness is the cause of idleness* are eliminated from consideration."

The findings should be a sufficient answer to the nonsense that unemployment is conducive to health.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Case of Mr. McKee

THE sudden tide for Joseph V. McKee for Mayor of New York City, which apparently reached a high mark at the end of the first week in October, was due to the rush of Tammany district leaders in the Bronx and Brooklyn to the "recovery" party. The performance could not fail to elicit sarcastic comment. The New York *Herald Tribune* politely referred to the deserting district bosses as "rodents." Langdon Post, independent Democrat on the fusion ticket, remarked more forthrightly: "The rats are leaving the sinking ship, but they are still the same rats." The reaction of the public within forty-eight hours was logical—that there was little to choose between the two Tammany factions.

Mr. McKee's record strengthens that growing belief. Except for the thirty September days of 1932, in which he captured popular approval by imposing some drastic economies, his performance for six years was one of unvarying subservience to the Tammany machine. Even much of what Mr. McKee did in the month that he was a headline hero was greatly exaggerated by the daily press. He was credited with cutting his own salary $15,000. What actually happened was that a week after his assumption of the duties of Acting Mayor, he was informed by Tammany's complaisant corporation counsel that he was entitled to draw the Mayor's full salary, $40,000 a year. He declared: "My salary will be $25,000, representing a cut of $15,000, beginning now." Actually he continued to draw the $25,000 salary he had been receiving, a salary which two years before, when the depression was well under way, he had voted to increase from $15,000! No sacrifice here. Had he reduced his salary and others to their pre-depression figure, that would have lent some color to his present promises to "eliminate every dollar of unnecessary expense and every unnecessary job." Elsewhere in this issue Paul Blanshard, a close student of city affairs, pictures the public record of Mr. McKee. Space lacks to detail all the extravagance which he countenanced. In addition to his salary boost, and in contrast with the one car which sufficed Mr. LaGuardia when he was President of the Board of Aldermen in 1919, Mr. McKee by 1930 had at his disposal four Cadillacs and a Packard, all owned by the city and maintained, as we should remember, at the public's expense.

As for Mr. McKee's alleged anti-Semitism, this should not be allowed to confuse the basic issue, namely, the salvaging of the city of New York. Let it be noted that "A Serious Problem" was written eighteen years ago when Mr. McKee was twenty-six years old. Doubtless he has since regretted writing as he did. One is led to believe that by his own denial of any intent to asperse the Jews, by the protestations from the McKee camp, and by the difficulty of finding a copy of the article in any of the public or university libraries in New York, where the volume itself is either missing or, if present, minus the pages containing the article.

Mr. McKee accuses his opponents of "tearing passages and sentences from their context for the deliberate purpose of producing a false impression"—a charge which a reading of the whole essay scarcely substantiates.

Broadway Looks Up

TO the great surprise of all concerned and unconcerned, the Broadway theatrical season has enjoyed an almost phenomenally successful beginning. Last year was, of course, disastrous, and there has seldom been a September which found the managers in a more gloomy frame of mind than did the one just past. The early openings were few and trivial. Even promises—with which the producers are generally so free—were conspicuously absent, and for a time it looked as though these dispirited gentlemen had simply decided not to open at all the plays which they felt sure would only close again.

Then, suddenly, Earl Carroll's "Murder at the Vanities" was a great success—though no one could tell exactly why. It was certainly inferior even as a revue, and conspicuously lacking in the lavishness which, at least, one expected from Mr. Carroll. What is more, it was almost universally "panned" with more than usual vehemence by the critics of the daily press. Nevertheless, before the week was out it was playing to near capacity. Next came the melodrama called "The Double Door," which received moderately favorable notices but soon was doing excellent business, and this in turn was followed by the Joe Cook revue, which began almost immediately to draw nearly capacity houses despite the fact that it, also, received only a tepid reception from the critics. By this time bewildered managers had begun to take manuscripts out of the desks where they were reposing, and the theatrical pages of the Sunday papers began to carry lengthening lists of productions about to open.

Nor has there been any sign so far that this is only a false dawn. "As Thousands Cheer," the first musical show to win enthusiastic reviews, was selling standing room almost from the time it opened, and three plays appearing shortly after immediately won places in the list of hits. "Men in White," the Group Theater's vivid play of hospital life, climbed to capacity during its second week; "Sailor, Beware!" a more or less Rabelaisian tale of sailors in love, drew excellent business immediately following a very favorable press reception; and the O'Neill comedy at the Guild Theater showed every sign of being destined for high public favor. It was noted that out of one group of seven openings five seemed almost certainly established for a profitable run, and one can realize how extraordinary that is only by remembering that even in the most prosperous seasons approximately eight out of every ten productions are financial failures.

No satisfactory explanation of the cheery phenomenon has yet been offered. The fact that a number of the new plays are above the average in interest may have something to do with it. But it is evident, on the other hand, that a public which flocked to see one or two of the earliest of the season's shows was a public sufficiently anxious to go to the theater not to be too choosy. Optimistic observers may conclude that good business in the theater is the first sign of returning prosperity and proof of the success of the NRA. The more melancholy may maintain, if they like, that a populace grown used to the depression has decided to enjoy itself while it can. In any event, the fact is clear. The theater is flourishing again.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

Two Americans: Hillquit and Adler

I MOURN the loss of Morris Hillquit, lawyer, author, and Socialist leader, whose death at sixty-four took place on the eighth of October. He was much too young to die. Indeed, as I get older I more and more recognize the wisdom of that passage in Bernard Shaw's "Methuselah" in which he points out that men pass from the scene at three score and ten, or even later, just when they have really learned something, when they possess great stores of knowledge and have profited by long experience. If we could prolong human life to the century mark it might be that we should advance faster, provided, however, that increased age would not make for ultra-conservatism. Morris Hillquit matured early and he had still a great deal to give us and much to teach us. From my first contact with him I was deeply impressed by a statesman-like quality in him which I characterized as European. It pleased him, not because he—or I—was snobbishly inclined toward Europeans and European methods, but because men in public life in England and on the Continent usually stand on a broader basis, with a greater understanding of the rest of the world, than do our public men. One felt in Hillquit a breadth of vision, an ability to study our problems not from the valley but from the hilltop, and one felt that he did not express himself without careful consideration. I always had the feeling when I met him that I was going to learn something from him and I was never disappointed.

As to his role in his party, I must leave that to others to appraise, for I have never been a member of his party and therefore know little or nothing of what went on at its councils. But I can well understand that his idealism made him hold rigidly to orthodox Marxism and look with suspicion upon those who sought to dilute the genuine brand of socialism and to adjust party policy to existing conditions. However much the party may have been split along this line, it was extremely fortunate to have a man like Morris Hillquit to fall back upon. His two campaigns for the mayoralty were dignified, extremely able, and altogether statesman-like. He knew the city, knew what it needed, and he neither compromised nor trimmed. Particularly was this true of him in his war-time campaign for Mayor. We were still at war; the ruthless spirit which characterized all our authorities from Woodrow Wilson down was rampant. Police cars were driven into any crowd of people, however legal and law-abiding, if Mayor Mitchel did not like their point of view or attitude. It made no difference to him, or to our other rulers, that the Constitution was ground under foot by them. But nothing deterred or frightened Morris Hillquit. His slogan was, "I will not kill." He was quite willing to face arrest and prosecution. The severer the attacks upon him, the calmer he became. I am happy to think that he rounded out his last political campaign with a record-breaking vote of nearly 250,000—he got 150,000 when the patrioteers, and especially the recreant Sons and Daughters of the Revolution, were denouncing this pacifist revolutionist because he could visualize a better and nobler America than they. I have read the tributes to him in the conservative newspapers, notably the New York *Times,* with a great deal of sardonic amusement. That cowardly and compromising sheet, owned by a fellow-Jew, would have gladly seen him torn limb from limb in 1917.

Still another great American Jew passed from the scene last April, and I take this belated opportunity to put on record my high regard for Felix Adler and for his achievements. He too was born abroad—Hillquit came from Latvia. He too was of the race which, in Germany, is once more being crucified. Though educated and cultured, both were the immigrants that prosperous and aristocratic Americans and our stupid labor leaders say should be rigidly excluded from the United States. Well, I do not happen to recall a single member of the Sons of the American Revolution who has made any such contribution to the ethical and moral development of the United States as Felix Adler made. He was a profound philosopher, a man with a splendid mind, which busied itself from beginning to end with the tremendous problems of human relationships, and always from the point of view of pure ethics. He had within him the making of a stoic. One felt of him that he could have drunk the hemlock with the equanimity of Socrates, and could have sat in judgment on his own children with complete impartiality. In a sense his mind functioned like a superbly operating machine. There were no missing spark plugs here, no grit in the gears, no backfiring. He went straight to the nub, and he never discussed an issue or a problem until he had viewed it from every angle. One felt in him the strength which comes from quiet meditation, from the ability to divest himself not only of considerations of creature comfort and of the flesh, but of any influences which might hamper a calm and detached survey of the problem.

Perhaps it was because of this rigid control of his emotions that those who did not know him well thought him cold and lifeless, lacking in feeling. They felt that his face was a mask, and so it was in that it hid on the public stage the profound emotions in those depths of his spiritual nature which far too few had the privilege of plumbing. None the less, he brought comfort and consolation to innumerable people. The members of his Ethical Culture congregation turned to him as the great rock of their salvation. They appealed to him first of all when some cruel stroke of fortune put them on the rack, made them question the justice of life and every belief that they held.

At twenty-four years of age, in 1876, he founded the Ethical Culture movement in America, a movement to apply ethics, pure and unabridged, to every problem of life, to create a religion of duty and of the brotherhood of man, which should flourish without the myths, the miracles, the rituals, the dogmas, and the idol-worship of the established religions. Naturally the movement was attacked, but it grew steadily. Not by any means as it should have. It set standards too high for most people, who wish, if they go to church at all, to have their panoplied bishops and cardinals, their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chants, their incense, their genuflections. It was, of course, not an atheistic movement; on the contrary, it recognized the presence of a divine force. It was, and is, a movement to establish a rational view of life, especially in its relation to the unknown. One reason why it did not grow faster, I suppose, was that it lacked warmth, and perhaps emotion, in its Sunday devotional services. Yet there have been times when I have sat in Felix Adler's audience and been more deeply stirred by him than by any other preacher that I ever listened to.

It was a source of deep regret to me that I had to break my ties with the Ethical Culture Society when the war came and it refused to take any position on that greatest tragedy of mankind. It was explained to me by some of the members that to do so would disrupt the society. I objected that that was the very argument made by all the churches, which were turning their backs upon the Prince of Peace and amending a certain Commandment to read: "Thou Shalt Kill." My objection met with few approvals. In the face of the greatest ethical disaster of modern times, the Ethical Culture Society remained silent. I thought it ought to speak out, and if necessary perish, in protest at the crucifixion of mankind. Had its leaders spoken out, I believe that the movement would be far, far stronger today than it is, just as I think that the Quakers, weak in numbers as they are, are stronger because of their policy during the war than they would otherwise have been. I would have had Felix Adler and his fellow-leaders imitate Wendell Phillips in his demand that if he died before emancipation of the American Negro it should be recorded on his tombstone that he re-refused to remain loyal to a church that was silent in the presence of a nation's sin, and that he was "recreant to a country which was a magnificent conspiracy against justice." But my feeling on this matter never for a moment affected my tremendous admiration for Felix Adler. Nor does it prevent me now from stating my honest belief that few men have made such contributions to the ethical welfare of the United States as did he; few men have more generously and completely served their adopted country.

And still there are multitudes among us who would put up the bars against any future Morris Hillquits and Felix Adlers. They forget that the greatest leader of mankind was a Jew who was born in a stable. I never hear people saying that we ought to shut out these ignorant, ill-bred South Europeans and Jews, and cling to the Nordic stock, without my gorge rising. I hate the ingratitude of it; I abhor the selfishness of it; I despise the folly of it, its readiness to shut the door on men and women seeking liberty and our way of life, among whom are to be found again and again individuals of purest gold whose contributions to our American life are priceless. My father, too, was an immigrant, but I hope that if he had been a native-born American I should still have sufficient justice to give every man his due, and to recognize such high idealism, such unselfish efforts for the betterment of their times, as distinguished Morris Hillquit and Felix Adler, and will, beyond all question, distinguish many others of their race in the years to come. That fine-hearted English Tory, Ormsby-Gore, told the Hitlerites to their faces in Geneva the other day that where Jews were decently treated they became the most loyal and patriotic of citizens. I know that he was right. Now as never before I think it is incumbent upon us who have no Jewish blood in our veins, and who know what the facts are, to bear our testimony.

Oswald Garrison Villard

LaGuardia Versus McKee

By PAUL BLANSHARD

NOT since Henry George ran for Mayor of New York in 1886 has any municipal election assumed such national importance as the present fight between LaGuardia and McKee in New York. When Fiorello H. LaGuardia was nominated for Mayor last August by a motley coalition, including the City Party and the Republican Party, most of the wise political prophets predicted his defeat by the all-powerful Tammany machine. Then, as the weeks went on, and successive tax programs of the O'Brien administration met with overwhelming public opposition, it became evident that New York was facing political upheaval.

Early in September it appeared that fusion had a chance to win. Late in September, with the defeat in the Democratic primaries of McCooey's choice for Controller by the opposition Tammany leader Frank J. Prial, it became evident that Tammany faced not a revolt but a whirlwind. Now, as I write these lines three weeks before election, all signs point to the worst defeat for O'Brien that any organization mayor has ever suffered. He is running a bad third in every newspaper, magazine, and theater straw vote. Like Taft in 1912, who carried only Vermont and Utah for reelection, O'Brien seems destined to be the worst-defeated incumbent his office has ever had.

The race is between McKee and LaGuardia, with the odds now favoring LaGuardia because of the enormous registration of voters, 2,322,000, only 16,000 fewer than the high-water mark of last year's Presidential election. If only 1,500,000 voters had registered, the task of the fusion nominee would have seemed hopeless. The silent vote is for the most part a non-Tammany vote. For many years Tammany has triumphed in New York elections largely because only half the people of New York take the trouble to vote at an ordinary city election. With 3,250,000 eligible voters in the city, fewer than 1,500,000 took the trouble to vote at the last election for aldermen in 1931. O'Brien was elected Mayor in 1932 for one year by only 28 per cent of the city's potential voters.

When, late in September, the approaching Tammany doom became apparent, Jim Farley, President Roosevelt's astute political manager, and Edward J. Flynn, for many years political boss of the Bronx, suddenly realized that they had the opportunity of a lifetime to gain control of the New

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

York City Democratic machine. As far as party enrolment is concerned, New York is overwhelmingly a Democratic city. Farley and Flynn reasoned that this fact, plus the personal popularity of Joseph V. McKee during his brief term as Acting Mayor in 1932, would give them a chance to defeat LaGuardia in November. They reasoned also that many conservative elements in the city, including reactionary Republicans who had followed the defeated Republican boss Sam Koenig, were distrustful of LaGuardia's progressivism. After days of argument, hesitation, and doubt they finally persuaded McKee to launch his candidacy on September 29. The entrance of McKee into the fight was so astounding that for the time being all political camps were thrown into complete confusion. The prestige of the President was so great that the meaning of the Farley-Flynn maneuver did not at first become apparent. Hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers saw in McKee, and still see in him, simply a clean man of the Roosevelt stripe, attempting to give the city a new deal in the Roosevelt manner.

One reason for the popularity of this conception of the man was the *World-Telegram's* effective campaign in his favor in 1932, when it persuaded a large number of citizens to write in his name on the ballot. The *World-Telegram* then overrated McKee as valiantly as it is now debunking him. The conception of McKee as a good man is partly due also to his personal appearance, his dignity, and his splendid radio personality. He is quiet and scholarly in his method of address; he is garbed pleasingly and correctly; his collars and neckties fit well; his face is always pink and well shaven; he is an Irish Catholic; no scandals have been printed concerning his private life. These are no mean qualifications for success in New York City politics. In fact, the form and manner of political campaigning are often more important than the substance. LaGuardia has none of McKee's smoothness. His radio voice is not good. He is immensely forceful but not polished. Although a native of New York, he comes from Italian stock, and there is still great prejudice in New York against Italian leadership.

But when one looks behind these superficial qualities the contrast in the records of the two men is amazing, especially so when one considers that many New Yorkers are balancing them as almost equal in reforming zeal. McKee has always been a machine politician; he served for years in the New York State Assembly without any signs of rebellion and sat for seven years at the right hand of Jimmie Walker on New York's Board of Estimate without once attacking the corruption that surrounded him. Not until he had been denied the regular Democratic nomination for Mayor in 1932 did he show any signs of breaking with his Tammany connections. After all the revelations of the Seabury inquiry he declared on September 12, 1932, while serving as Acting Mayor, "I am an organization Democrat, always have been, and always will be."

I do not say here that the record of McKee can be used as the basis of any certain prophecy concerning his future conduct. He is a shrewd and an ambitious man. If he is elected Mayor of New York it is possible that his character will definitely change for the better. In the past his reticence in the presence of corruption has been based upon personal ambition and the fear that any other course might mean political doom. That same personal ambition and astuteness might lead him as Mayor of New York to give the city a sound and progressive administration, because the line of promotion of a Mayor of New York is away from machine politics toward the governorship and the Presidency. And it still pays for a man to be good in the *upper* reaches of American politics.

If Joseph V. McKee is elected Mayor of New York, however, and becomes a courageous progressive, he must overcome one of the worst coteries of political gangsters in American politics, the district leaders of the McCooey, Flynn, and Curry machine, who have recently climbed upon his bandwagon in the desperate effort to save their jobs. Space will not permit me here to call the roll of these various leaders who are now supporting McKee. They include former License Commissioner James F. Geraghty, whose department was found to be a "hotbed of petty graft" by the Meyer Legislative Investigating Committee. They include the notorious James W. Brown, Bronx political leader and godfather of former Magistrate Silbermann, who admitted on the witness stand before Judge Seabury that district leaders considered it their "civic duty" to intercede with magistrates in cases pending before them, and who remarked, "That is the way we make Democrats." They include "Hymie" Schorenstein, register of Kings County, who claims that he can read and write. They include, besides a host of others, Kenneth F. Sutherland, boss of the Sixteenth District of Brooklyn, who for many years drew $10,000 as McKee's assistant in the office of the president of the Board of Aldermen. In fact, nothing could possibly have occurred in the course of the campaign that would more clearly reveal the nature of the forces supporting McKee than the desertion to his standard of many of Tammany's worst district leaders. The Seabury inquiry made clear that the fundamental force in New York's corruption is the district-leader system, a system whereby the political leaders in each assembly district fix judges, choose court clerks, and issue orders to the Mayor. The fact that these same leaders, after years of association with Joseph V. McKee in the same political party, have now decided to support him is the best imaginable proof of his past character and future weakness.

LaGuardia, on the fusion side, has very few embarrassments. In minor places on his ticket are many commonplace Republicans, but LaGuardia is burdened with no political boss. The defeat of Sam Koenig and the desertion to McKee of the most reactionary financial interests have left LaGuardia free to be himself. The guiding spirit of his campaign is Samuel Seabury, whose integrity is unquestioned, and whose fearlessness is so extreme that at times it becomes very bad politics. If McKee is elected, his office will swarm with Flynn henchmen, and Flynn will doubtless succeed Curry as the political boss of New York. If LaGuardia is elected, it is equally obvious that he will not owe allegiance to any political overlord. His difficulty will not be subservience to a political boss but the unification of the many diverse elements that are now working for his success. Some Socialists are charging that he is a bankers' candidate because he has one running mate who is an officer in a financial institution, but the description is obviously nothing more than political oratory in view of the make-up of the fusion slate. It is a motley slate, as any slate would be when made up so hurriedly, but it is not a bankers' slate. Hearst, who is supporting McKee, is attacking LaGuardia on the other flank

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by calling him "the little red flower of communism." Incidentally, the LaGuardia slate has more leading Democrats than Republicans. What is more important than any associations of LaGuardia's is the forthright manner in which he has spoken in this campaign, and the record of the man in thirty-two years of public life. He has never pulled his punches in Congress, and it seems to be as certain as anything can be in politics that if he is sent to the City Hall he will exercise the vast powers of the Mayor of New York with economic insight and political independence.

Let us test LaGuardia and his rival, McKee, by the two most important criteria: what is the record of the two men in public life, and what do the two men stand for in the present campaign? While McKee has played the role of a political regular all his life, LaGuardia has been a bold rebel leading the fight in Congress for almost every progressive measure advocated by the pioneers of American social reform. He was the author of the anti-injunction bill which abolished the yellow-dog contract; he fought for old-age pensions, national unemployment insurance, a federal employment bureau, the five-day week, and employers' liability laws. He has been a staunch enemy of the power monopolies and he fought for the public development of Muscle Shoals. No man in Congress worked harder than he did for unemployment relief or against child labor.

Apparently McKee's natural inclinations have been against these progressive measures of economic control that have been the central aims of LaGuardia's political life. Again and again at the Board of Estimate I have watched McKee's face during discussions about unemployment relief. I have heard his cold, parsimonious comments on the extremity of the unemployed. All through these last years of the great depression McKee has abetted the niggardly policy of Tammany in giving to the unemployed of New York City less than the amount necessary to sustain them decently. He has united with the Tammany politicians in keeping down relief to a figure approximately one-fourth of that which the welfare agencies themselves estimate is necessary to maintain a family at the decency level. His educational philosophy is equally reactionary. He complained before the Board of Estimate at a public hearing on school expenditures last year because public funds were being spent on children more than fourteen years of age.

At a hearing before the Board of Estimate on the tentative budget for 1933 McKee, after hearing pleas for the retention of continuation schools and adult education, said:

> Where is education going to stop? We are carrying on classes in stenography and the like for adults. We did it because we had the money at one time. Now that we propose to stop it, we are attacked. It is my belief that if pupils are more than fourteen years old we have gone too far beyond American ideals in education. We are pampering and softening boys and girls. It wasn't so many years ago that boys were working for a living when they were fourteen. Now we are educating boys of eighteen and over, and inclining their minds toward theories of government education far beyond what is necessary.

This conservative attitude of McKee on educational matters has been the occasion for the unwelcome intrusion of the religious issue into the campaign. Now that the issue has been raised it may as well be admitted that it plays an important part in the struggle. For several weeks it continued in the whispering stage. McKee, it was said, had attacked the Jews, and Tammany was printing two million copies of a statement of his for use among Jewish voters. The facts were not particularly secret, for the statement had been published with large headlines on the front page of the Brooklyn *Eagle* of November 19, 1932, and had been partially requoted in the *World-Telegram* of October 12 last. Finally, it was dragged into the headlines and on to the front pages of the papers of October 15. The original statement, more anti-Socialist than anti-Semite, was contained in an article on education by McKee in the *Catholic World* of May, 1915, written when he was a teacher at De Witt Clinton High School and a frequent contributor to Catholic journals. McKee wrote:

> Our city is the most cosmopolitan city in the world, with inhabitants of every race and creed. Of the 5,000,000 people, about 75 per cent are Christians, of whom Catholics constitute 76.5 per cent. The Jewish race constitutes a little over 1,000,000 or about 25 per cent. This is a ratio of three Christians to one Jew.
>
> Yet when we examine the enrolment of our city high schools, we find that less than 25 per cent are Christians—that more than 75 per cent are of Jewish stock. Although the Jewish people are in such a minority, their children possess an overwhelming majority in our high schools. . . .
>
> After the election last November a composition entitled "Why I Like the Election" was given to five classes totaling about 150 boys. On examining the papers the writer found that over 90 per cent of these students rejoiced particularly in one thing, the election to Congress of the Socialist, Meyer London. These were pupils drawn from many classes of the school, and were representative of the whole student body.
>
> The fact stated is merely an indication of their attitude on one of the vital economic questions of the day. In overwhelming numbers these students are Socialists, or Socialists in the making, whose gospel is contained in the New York *Call,* and whose ambition is the furtherance of socialistic dogma.
>
> Whatever hold the teachings of Zionism had upon these people is lost when the children learn English. The obligations of the orthodox Judaism of their fathers and mothers prove irksome in the competition for material advancement, and are soon laid aside. The influence of religion, consequently, is a negligible factor in shaping their thoughts and actions.
>
> In oral discussions on such topics as "Is Lying Justifiable?" or "Is It Wrong to Cheat?" their words consistently show that they recognize no code of morals, and are governed by no motives higher than those originating from fear of detection and consequent loss in money. Surely we cannot look for ideal results from such material.
>
> It is to such as these that our children who are without the benefits of education must bow in later years. It would be denying that result follows cause to gainsay this, for training and education do give to the possessor advantages over his more poorly equipped fellow. We are giving them the sharper tools, the better instruments, and then are expecting our children to cope successfully with them. It must follow that in the years to come our handicapped boys will be forced to give way in competition for better positions and higher advancement in law, medicine, education, and business. It was only recently that a prominent authority on education remarked that "within twenty years these people will be in control of our public education."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Neither LaGuardia nor McKee, of course, will bring about a social revolution in New York City. Within the framework of our State and federal governments what could a good Mayor accomplish? He could not, even if he were a Socialist, with a Socialist Board of Estimate, go very far in the direction of public ownership without running afoul of the State constitution and the conservative legislature at Albany. New York does not have the power to build its own houses, operate its own buses, or own its own banks; and none of these powers can be obtained without the consent of Albany. In general, there are four important and permanent things that a progressive administration in New York City could accomplish. It could give the city a new charter with proportional representation and thoroughly reorganized departments; it could eliminate political job-holders and establish a genuine merit system throughout the whole government; it could launch a large municipal housing development with the help of the federal government, although even this might require the approval of Albany; it could unify New York City's transit system, with municipal ownership and operation and the maintenance of the five-cent fare. It is difficult to see how any city administration could go beyond these four things until a more progressive party captured the State and federal governments and released the city from some of the present restraining limitations upon its governmental powers. Public ownership of electric and gas companies, for example, is probably impossible in the next four years because of the city's recent agreement with the bankers to limit real-estate taxes, and because of the general unsalability of New York City's bonds.

On all of these practical issues the position of LaGuardia is absolutely clear, while the position of McKee is either hostile or doubtful. McKee is opposed to public housing and has even expressed great hostility to tax exemption for any kind of housing enterprise. When he opposed the recent Hillside housing development in the Bronx, which, incidentally, would have put many hundred people to work, he declared that there were no slums in the Bronx, his own borough, although it is notorious that the Bronx has some appalling sections. When he appeared before Judge Seabury, McKee spoke vaguely about minority representation, but he has never come out flat-footedly as LaGuardia has for the practice of proportional representation. If LaGuardia became Mayor and put into effect his charter plan, it would give the Socialist Party its first opportunity for revival in many years, since it could be represented on a municipal council in proportion to its total vote in each borough. McKee would strengthen and enlarge the borough presidents' offices, which now are centers of incompetence and local patronage; LaGuardia would continue the office of borough president, but would make each borough president a kind of acting mayor for executive work, with only very limited powers.

In the great unemployment relief crisis which afflicts New York, LaGuardia has come out for cash relief, more relief stations, the abolition of the "skip-feed" system of relief, and the payment of rent before evictions instead of afterwards. He favors the consolidation of the Home Relief Bureau, the Work Relief Bureau, and the City Free Employment Bureau. He has pledged himself to abolish all political favoritism in relief.

Both McKee and LaGuardia stand for the unification of subways and municipal ownership with the five-cent fare, but the record of McKee in regard to transit during his seven years as president of the Board of Aldermen raises a grave question as to his attitude toward traction companies. He not only voted for the notorious Equitable bus bill which was one of the main factors in bringing about the downfall of Jimmie Walker, but he did it as part of a larger deal in which a favorite Bronx bus company received a cut of the franchise pie. Walker supported McKee's favorite company in the Bronx, and McKee supported the Equitable Coach Company's franchise at Walker's request. Even after the Equitable Coach Company had been disclosed as an irresponsible and fly-by-night concern, McKee voted to continue its franchise in force.

This record of the man is immensely important in view of the transit crisis in New York. Within two years after taking office the new Mayor of the city will be compelled to recapture or purchase from the great transit companies the present subway and elevated lines, or lose the five-cent fare. The State law requires that within two years the new city-owned system must be self-supporting, and it is unthinkable that this new city system could adopt a ten-cent fare while the private lines operated on a five-cent fare. Quick and aggressive bargaining with the transit companies can save the five-cent fare, and these companies know that LaGuardia and his associates are men who cannot be fixed.

McKee is now making eloquent promises concerning municipal housecleaning, but it is not even clear that under Flynn's rule he would be able to eliminate those whose faithlessness is a matter of public record. One of McKee's last official acts as Acting Mayor was to restore to the city's pay roll his own chief examiner, Francis T. McEneny, whom Leonard Wallstein, in his investigation of the condemnation racket, had caught red-handed. Wallstein proved that McEneny had used McKee's office for getting inside information concerning schoolhouse land that the city was about to buy. When the scandal became public, McKee was forced to dismiss McEneny, but some mysterious power forced the reinstatement of McEneny even after the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court had declared in an official decision: "McEneny is shown to have deceived his superior, and therefore was removed from his position."

Several times in New York's history, when the tide of anger has risen against Tammany's misrule, adroit substitutes have been put forward who have given the city certain obvious and surface reforms, but who have left the Tammany district leaders secure in their favored positions. Gaynor, in spite of his bold public pronouncements, left most of the Tammany army in office, so that when he was dead Tammany came back with all its old arrogance. All signs now point to McKee as the new "good man" chosen to satisfy the public clamor for reform, but destined, if he should be elected, to shift only slightly the leadership and methods of the old machine.

From the long-range point of view the coming election in New York is important not only because the election of LaGuardia might bring new faith in the capacity of a city to use democracy intelligently, but because LaGuardia, with his social progressivism, could make out of New York a gigantic laboratory for civic reconstruction. Certainly his record indicates that his elevation to New York's City Hall might mean a genuine new deal for a long-suffering metropolis.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Suppressed Advertisement Concerning R. H. Macy

THE boycott against the Nazis which has grown spontaneously in many parts of the world attracted unprecedented public notice in New York City recently when R. H. Macy and Company, the city's largest department store, decided to state its position in a full-page advertisement published on October 2 in the New York daily press. This advertisement was apparently the result of many criticisms of Macy's policy of buying in Nazi Germany, and of the consequent withdrawal of patronage by customers. The episode takes on its special interest because of the rejection by the leading New York morning papers of an advertisement offered in answer by Samuel Untermyer, as president of the American League for the Defense of Jewish Rights, to statements contained in Macy's advertisement. The background of this situation may be briefly summarized as follows.

Since the establishment of the Nazi regime last spring and the publication of its acts and policies, many customers of Macy's have written letters protesting against the store's buying goods in Germany. These protesters received letters in reply. On August 1, in answer to a letter written by a customer on July 30 objecting to Macy's advertising of German cheeses, and protesting against Macy and Company's buying of goods in Germany, Percy S. Straus, president of R. H. Macy and Company, wrote as follows:

> I have your letter of July 30 in which you protest against our advertising German cheeses. I think you are right. We should not advertise them.
>
> As to whether or not we should carry German merchandise, that is a different matter, which has been discussed at a meeting of the chief executives of this corporation. It was the unanimous expression that individually all of us, both Jew and Gentile, were sympathetic to showing our disgust of the Hitlerite attitude toward the Jews, but as trustees for the stockholders and employees of Macy's, we could not permit our emotions to control our actions.
>
> Were we without responsibility in the matter, our first reaction would be to stop buying German goods, but facing our responsibility, we have so far deferred taking any action.
>
> For your information, our total imports from all foreign countries approximate about 5 per cent of our business, and Germany's share of this has grown steadily less as the effect of such censorship as yours is making itself felt.
>
> All our German goods are clearly marked with the country of origin. Therefore you yourself can exercise your own censorship in this store.

On October 2, in the full-page advertisement entitled "Three Personal Letters Concerning the Sale of German Goods by Department Stores in the United States," Mr. Straus, quoting a letter he had written on September 15 to an unnamed customer, wrote:

> Dear Mr.——: I have your letter of September 13 and am glad you have written me so frankly.
>
> In view of your desire not to purchase German goods, I feel that I should explain to you as explicitly as I can exactly what our policy is, and am confident that when you understand it fully, you will realize that our sentiments are no different from your own.
>
> I have no desire to conceal the fact that up to the present we have continued to handle a small quantity of goods of German manufacture. However, our purchases in Germany have rapidly diminished and are now being confined to that type of merchandise which we cannot obtain elsewhere, particularly such things as china and glassware, in which we have open-stock patterns, which we are obligated to maintain for hundreds of customers who need replacements. Ninety-five per cent of all our sales are of American-made goods. Our total importations from all foreign countries approximate only about 5 per cent of our business. All German goods which we sell are clearly marked with the name of the country of origin, and no one need buy German goods. We do not press them for sale or advertise them.
>
> This had been our policy up to the moment. I may tell you that it has been the policy, according to my information, of all the other important New York stores. [See (4) below.] We know of no important store which has entirely discarded the sale of German goods. The subject of our handling German goods is continuing to receive careful attention, and our ultimate policy will be determined by considerations which will in our judgment contribute practically toward accomplishing results which we desire to see realized as much as you do.
>
> As a loyal Jew, it is hardly necessary for me to tell you that personally I bitterly resent the treatment of the Jews in Germany, just as you do and just as should any American, be he Jew or Gentile.
>
> We are, however, deeply concerned with helping the position of the Jews in Germany, with whom we have the greatest sympathy. In so far as we are now making any purchases in Germany, we have instructed our buyers to purchase goods, when available, only from Jewish manufacturers, many of whom we are advised are still permitted to function in Germany. If we boycott such firms their plight will be harder than it is now.
>
> The question of general policy in this matter is a very large and serious one, involving many considerations and obligations. My emotions as a Jew are exactly the same as your own, but we do not feel at liberty in view of all our responsibilities to allow our emotions to govern actions which may have far-reaching results, possibly against Jews themselves, without the most careful investigation and deliberate reflection.
>
> We trust that you will realize, therefore, that at heart we have the same purposes which you have, namely, in the interests of humanity to do what we can to help the plight of the Jews in Germany. In our efforts to contribute effectively toward accomplishing that result we cannot allow ourselves to be led into impetuous actions simply because our emotions are stirred with a sense of outrage. We realize that hundreds of thousands of Jews still remain in Germany. My own influence will be exerted toward making the present unbearable lot of these Jews more presently tolerable, and to support influences which will restore to unoffending Jews in Germany the exercise of all the rights to which as human beings they are entitled.
>
> [Signed] PERCY S. STRAUS, president

In reply, Samuel Untermyer composed an advertisement entitled "An Open Letter in Reply to the Advertisement of R. H. Macy and Company," addressed to Percy S. Straus, Esq., president, R. H. Macy and Company, and offered it to the morning papers for insertion on October 3. The *Times*, the *Herald Tribune*, and the *American* refused to print it. Reasons given to *The Nation* for their refusal vary. *The Nation* deems the matter of such public interest that it here gives space to Mr. Untermyer's suppressed advertisement.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN OPEN LETTER
in Reply to the Advertisement of
R. H. Macy and Company Entitled "Three Personal Letters"
Concerning the Continued Sale
by Them of German Goods

PERCY S. STRAUS, ESQ.,
PRESIDENT, R. H. MACY AND COMPANY:

If you had been as frank with your anonymous customer as might have been expected, his answer would doubtless have been very different.

If, for instance, you had, as you should have, told him:

1. That you had no right to speak for the "department stores in the United States" and that all of them (including non-Jewish stores), unlike your company, do not, as you imply, continue to buy goods made in Germany. Some of them, including non-Jewish-owned stores, have discontinued the practice or are about to do so;

2. That unlike your company, they no longer continue to maintain agencies in Germany for the purchase of goods there;

3. That unlike your company, they have not recently bought "blocked marks" in Germany at a heavy discount, which your company is said to have used in making purchases in Germany;

4. That the decision of the New York department stores to which you refer, against refusing further to handle goods made in Germany, is said to have been influenced largely by your leadership as the most important store in the group, supported by another Jewish-managed store in New York City; that so long as you persisted in continuing to buy German goods you would have maintained an unfair advantage over them if they had failed to follow your lead; that they preferred not to subject themselves to such unequal competition from your company;

5. That you are managing to hold rather firmly in check your convictions and sympathies as to Judaism, to which you so feelingly refer, since you must know that among the signatures of the department stores to your published announcement are those of non-Jewish stores that have ceased to buy goods made in Germany;

6. That Jewish manufacturers are no longer permitted to function in Germany, except very recently and in rare instances, and only under the most stringent Hitler control and conservators who have supplanted and superseded the Jewish owners, and that these few concerns have been forced to discharge all Jewish employees;

7. That there has long existed the most rigid boycott by the German people of the identical concerns from which you say you continue to make part of your purchases, solely because of their Jewish ownership;

8. That Germany has no monopoly in the manufacture or sale of gloves, textiles, chinaware, or any of the articles you continue to buy there. Apparently it is only a question of price, and as the other department stores in New York would doubtless gladly follow your lead if you took your purchasing agents out of Germany and dealt elsewhere, you would be under no disadvantage in doing so;

9. That the "dangerous precedent" of the boycott, to which you so feelingly refer, is in no respect dangerous nor is it a "precedent" in that it is a purely defensive *counter-boycott* against a vastly more impressive and all-embracing boycott that is being enforced against all Jews in Germany. It follows the precedent that was set by Germany when it brutally inaugurated and actively continued to prosecute the boycott of Jewish manufacturers and shopkeepers and professional men by the entire German nation for the avowed purpose of destroying their means of livelihood and of ruining and exterminating the German Jews;

10. That your statement that "all German-made goods we sell are clearly marked with the name of the country of origin" can be, and I supposed it had been, overwhelmingly disproved to your satisfaction. I do not by this mean to imply that you have knowingly been a party to the continuous violations and evasions of law that have been and are being practiced upon the American public in that respect, some of which have been, as you are well aware, called to the attention of the federal authorities.

Although this incredible "crime of the centuries" is aimed at every loyal unoffending Jewish citizen solely because he or one of his grandparents happened to be a Jew, this is not, as you seem to assume, a Jewish question. It far transcends in principle and importance all limitations of race and creed. It is the struggle of civilization and humanity against a reversion to the bigotry, fanaticism, and barbarism of medieval times.

Germany's crime against all womanhood regardless of creeds in ousting women from all business occupations and condemning them to the fate of breeders of children and household drudges is enlisting, as it is bound to enlist, the outraged protest of men and women the world over, as is its suppression of voluntary organized labor and its rigid exclusion of all Jews from labor unions.

With a gagged press and with freedom of speech made a crime punishable by death, this is the only way by which the knowledge of world opinion can reach into Germany. When the world refuses to deal with Germany, when its factories are closed and its workmen unemployed, its people may awaken to the enormity of the crime its government is perpetrating against civilization. That is the only effective weapon against it and the only language it can be made to understand.

No self-respecting man or woman of any race or creed will, in my judgment, buy German-made goods or patronize a store where they are sold.

It may seem to you ungrateful that your fellow-citizens do not appreciate your self-denial in lending the patronage of your company to the defeat of the boycott, by buying goods in Germany and thus prolonging the misery of German Jews and adding to the prosperity of that benighted country whose persecutions of your fellow-Jews you denounce in such eloquent terms, whilst at the same time you continue to maintain your agencies in Germany and to buy German goods. In that connection they are curious to know the amounts of such purchases within the last ninety days and what proportion, if any, was really bought from Jewish manufacturers, of whom they are told that few, if any, are still in existence and that those have been forced virtually to abdicate their control.

This movement has as yet barely begun in this country. It is much further advanced in foreign countries throughout the world. A campaign for funds, *strictly confined to the prosecution of the boycott,* will be launched throughout the country by the undersigned organizations. It has no connection whatever with appeals of any other organizations for funds to support other movements. The proceeds will be used strictly for boycott activities.

WORLD JEWISH ECONOMIC FEDERATION
and its American branch
AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR THE DEFENSE OF JEWISH RIGHTS
by SAMUEL UNTERMYER, president

Letters were interchanged between Mr. Straus and Mr. Untermyer in which each stated his position without any meeting of minds. These letters add nothing essential to the published material. In fairness to R. H. Macy and Company, *The Nation* deemed it proper to learn at first hand its position. This position may be summarized as follows:

> Percy S. Straus, president of R. H. Macy and Company, declares that Macy's asked no newspaper to suppress Mr. Untermyer's "open letter." Mr. Straus saw a proof of the advertisement for the first time the day after the morning papers had declined it.
>
> Mr. Straus states that with respect to many of the points referred to in Mr. Untermyer's "open letter," Mr. Untermyer is misinformed. As to Macy's itself, Mr. Straus emphasizes that his store is following exactly the same

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy as that adopted by all the other important stores in New York. That policy was determined upon following the recommendations of a committee of store managers, upon which committee Macy's was not represented. Macy's had previously indicated its willingness to follow the action of a majority.

It has been represented to Macy's by those promoting a German boycott that it would be good business for Macy's to lead such a boycott. Macy's took the position that it never had attempted to capitalize public calamity for profit, and would not do so now.

Mr. Straus considers it important to draw a clear distinction between the action of an individual in refusing, for any reason which appeals to him, to buy goods, and that, on the other hand, of a large mercantile establishment which undertakes to cater to the demands of all its customers in refusing to sell goods which its customers want. Macy's has followed the policy of the other New York stores in declining to establish an absolute boycott. Macy's reasons are twofold:

First: Public Policy. Action on the part of a large business house which tends to accentuate racial cleavage in the United States is un-American. The policy of a mercantile establishment ought not to be directed to inculcating or to opposing the views of anyone on the ground of race, creed, or politics.

Second: Mercantile Policy. It is the obligation of a department store to furnish to customers the goods which they have been accustomed to find on its counters and which the customers desire to find there. Macy's is, accordingly, buying in Germany only such goods as may be demanded by its customers which cannot be purchased anywhere else. No German goods are being either advertised or pressed for sale.

Mr. Straus states that there is steady diminution of the demand for German goods at Macy's store, and, accordingly, that the amount purchased by Macy's in Germany is constantly dwindling. Macy's on its own account has also initiated a policy of stimulating the manufacture in the United States and other countries of certain qualities of goods which for the present are made satisfactorily only in Germany. This procedure is under way, but necessarily the results of it cannot be realized immediately.

Macy's present purchases of German goods constitute but a small fraction of 1 per cent of its total purchases. If present tendencies continue, the small supply of German goods which Macy's offers will in the course of another year dwindle to almost nothing.

Airing the Airship

By S. FITZ-RANDOLPH and H. PHILLIPS

THE Macon and the Graf Zeppelin are today the best the world has to show for seventy-five years of research and experimentation in rigid airships. So far one hundred and fifty of these craft have been built. When the World War began, Germany had fourteen; later 110 others were constructed. At the close of the war the Allies took the eight Germany had left. There had been a terrific mortality. Today, with only two major dirigibles surviving, it is timely to question whether the expenditure of more public money on airships is advisable.

The truth is that dirigible builders have never been able to overcome leakage. The last word in dirigible construction, the Akron, lost one-third of her helium on her first trip to the coast, a distance not half her estimated range. Other dirigibles the world over have had the same difficulty. Dirigible champions in this country declared that the R-101's trouble was caused by the use of hydrogen instead of helium. Then the helium-inflated Shenandoah cracked up. The champions of dirigibles next declared that helium-filled ships would still be safe over water. Now the Akron has punctured that theory. Nothing remains but to declare that dirigibles should avoid storms, and this the Naval Court of Inquiry and the Joint Congressional Committee did quite heartily. The Macon's commander agreed so entirely with this view that he delayed trial flights many times, and on one occasion abandoned a proposed twelve-hour cruise at the end of eight hours, when clouds appeared. If the dirigible must run to cover at the sight of every cloud, it is difficult to see its practical value.

In military maneuvers the Los Angeles proved "of little value, even for scouting." Compared with the airplane, the dirigible is slow, unwieldy, easily sighted, and a splendid target, while its own gun range is hampered by its bulging sides. Enemy airplanes can pounce down from above and destroy it before the airship's own planes can attack. Besides, the dirigible is expensive. The Akron has cost American taxpayers, at a conservative estimate, $10,000,000, not counting the pensions still to be paid to the dependents of the men lost on her. The hangar at Akron alone cost $2,000,000, on which no return has been realized.

In spite of these facts, the Joint Congressional Committee appointed to investigate the Akron disaster recommended unconditionally, contrary to the proposed plan of abandoning the Lakehurst hangar since the Macon was to be stationed on the Pacific, that the hangar be kept and the Los Angeles reconditioned as a training ship. It also advised construction of another ship to replace the Akron, and urged not letting other countries outdo ours in dirigible construction and management. The report was, of course, based upon the testimony of witnesses. But these, for the most part, had interests which led them to testify in favor of dirigibles. To be sure, no lighter-than-air expert gave testimony negativing further dirigible construction, for today the only experts of this type in the United States are in the navy or with some commercial firm promoting airship construction. Naval officers whose pay and promotion are involved are apt to rationalize their testimony. Experts in airship building would scarcely make statements reflecting upon themselves or their ability. Men with commercial interests in airships or airship materials naturally urge government support of their construction.

Certain facts connected with the witnesses at the inquiry are worthy of note. Capable as Commander Rosendahl is, he could not prevent an accident to the Akron on February 22, 1932, at Lakehurst, nor the death of two men on her at San Diego. None of the Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation officials who testified were called upon to show whether their company refunded to the government the $5 per pound for excess weight of the Akron, to the extent of approximately $25,000, or to explain the increase in shares of common stock issued by the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company from 1,450,000 to 5,000,000 sixteen months after

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actual contracts for the building of the Akron and the Macon were signed. Colonel Lindbergh did not have to reveal that his attorney, Colonel Breckenridge, counsel for the committee, is or was at one time a stockholder, voting trustee, and director in an air company the majority of whose stock is controlled by a member company of the United Aircraft Corporation, and that it in turn is one of a group of concerns which was represented by Charles E. Mitchell of the National City Company in his negotiations with Dr. Eckener for international Zeppelin transportation service; further that mail subsidies and other appropriations have been urged for the past three years in Congress as the nucleus upon which this transportation service and two others like it (one sponsored by the Harriman Bank) proposed formation.

As long ago as 1929 a public statement was made, and never repudiated, that Senator Bingham's "position as head of the National Aeronautic Association was manipulated by interests profiting largely from government aircraft contracts. A gigantic air trust . . . and its lobby have worked for the passage of legislation that diverted millions of the government's money to the pockets of the trust. . . ." Captain Anton Heinen's expert knowledge did not prevent his own private dirigible venture from ending disastrously. Jerome C. Hunsaker, formerly a federal employee for aeronautics, is vice-president of the Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation which cooperated with the Guggenheim Foundation to establish an institute for airship study in Akron. And now Mr. Hunsaker has been rewarded by the Guggenheim Medal for "contributions to the science of aerodynamics, to the science and art of aircraft design, and to the practical construction and commercial utilization of rigid airships." His company built the Akron, which last word in "practical" rigid-airship construction carried seventy-three men to their death.

The burden of much of the testimony was that the dirigible had a practical commercial value. Legislation authorizing dirigible building will undoubtedly be urged. Meanwhile a continuation of construction is assured, to judge by the complacency with which the Congressional gentlemen from Ohio viewed the naval appropriations bill, which was worded to permit of such construction. The public would have no quarrel with those who have faith in the dirigible if the latter would also pay the bills.

Illness and Recovery

By PAUL Y. ANDERSON

Baltimore, October 14

IF you hunger and thirst after knowledge about hydrotherapy, hydriatics, and the revivifying effects of ping pong, I am your man. I can tell you something about dream interpretation, occupational therapeutics, and the proper construction of stepladders. I might even pass out a few pointers on sleep-habit forming. But don't ask any questions about NRA, AAA, PWA, or any other three-letter recovery program. I last saw General Johnson in a hospital, and the day after he was discharged from the Walter Reed I was admitted to the Johns Hopkins. To me the Blue Eagle is only a bird of distant memory. In short, my friends, I am enjoying what is known to the vulgar as a "nervous breakdown," although I believe the term is unknown in medical science. Whatever it is called, the genius who discovered or invented it deserves the grateful thanks of the working classes. No more satisfactory formula for eluding the ardors of productive labor has ever come to my attention. I only wish to know how long it has been going on. Let other and better reporters contract flat feet from plodding endlessly through the hard corridors of the Commerce Building at Washington. Let them vegetate in the White House press-room or wear their trousers thin in the outer offices of Secretaries Ickes and Wallace. No such lot is mine. On the contrary, I loll voluptuously for hours in a hammock suspended in a tank of warm water, dozing or being read to by beautiful females in starched uniforms. At my convenience the routine is varied by the carpenter shop and the gymnasium, or, duly attended, I am permitted to hook and slice—mostly slice—my way around the neighborhood golf course. In the past various persons have intimated that I should be placed under observation. This has now been done on my own motion, and I trust they are satisfied. I certainly am.

ON occasions a small voice hints that I ought to be ashamed of resorting to such a device as a "nervous breakdown," but the voice is very small, and the occasions are diminishing in number. Surveying the Washington scene from a distance, I say it's a headache, and I say to hell with it. Such moods are always subject to the influence of chemical changes, but that is how I feel now. Do the cotton-textile manufacturers continue to cheat on their code by firing experienced hands and rehiring them as "apprentices"? I wouldn't know. Does Henry Ford insist on exercising his preference to go out of the automobile business rather than deal collectively with his employees? I wouldn't care. Has the newspaper publishers' committee persisted in its campaign of wire-pulling and intimidation in order to evade the responsibilities of a code of fair practice? Doubtless, judging from its record, but I decline to worry. Two psychiatrists, the great Adolf Meyer and his brilliant young associate, Dr. Edward G. Billings, are trying to put me together so that I will tick again, and until the outcome of that noble experiment is known I shall remain more or less oblivious to outside concerns. It is astounding to discover how much solid satisfaction resides in a hand saw, a jack plane, a chisel, and a few poplar planks. Does the average man—barring carpenters—have any idea how many separate and distinct processes enter into the construction of a simple stepladder? Your venerable correspondent is now engaged upon the seventh or eighth, and the thing is beginning to take form but dimly. Or take the game of ping pong. For years, in my ignorance, I employed the name derisively, to denote physical frailty or effeminacy. Do not fall into the same error, my masters. The demands which the game makes upon eye, wind, and limb are almost as brutal as those imposed by tennis. There is a vast comfort to be derived from the rediscovery of simple pleasures. A month ago it would hardly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have occurred to me that I should be perfectly content on this date to sit on a bench in the sun and think of nothing in particular—but here I am.

* * * * *

TO be sure, one can hardly refrain from looking over the newspapers and ruminating on some of the contents. This reporter is especially intrigued by the refusal of "Brutal Bill" Humphreys to accept his removal from the Federal Trade Commission by President Roosevelt. The President's mistake in this instance lay in asking Humphreys to resign like a gentleman, instead of removing him for cause. It would have been extremely easy to make a case against him. Only a few weeks after the late Calvin appointed him Humphreys declared in a public speech that he intended to reverse the policies of the commission. Instead of proceeding against business concerns which had violated the law, he said, the commission would "cooperate" by showing them how they could accomplish their ends without violating the law. Not within my memory has a public official made such a brazen declaration of his intent to frustrate the purpose of the statute which he had taken an oath to support. Soon thereafter, in an interview with this writer, he reiterated even more bluntly his intention of sabotaging the work of the commission. He went to the extreme of saying that commission employees who insisted on carrying out the investigations in which they had been engaged would be discharged from the staff. "If the commission has been going east, you may rest assured that hereafter it will be going west," he grimly declared. Prior to his appointment, and subsequent to his defeat for reelection to Congress, Humphreys acted as a lobbyist in Washington for certain Northwestern lumber interests. His appointment was a scandal, and his official conduct was an outrage to public decency. I note a disposition on the part of certain Republican leaders to make an issue of his dismissal. In other words, the "Roosevelt luck" still holds.

* * * * *

THE President's intervention in the "captive" mine situation in Pennsylvania was excellently timed. Here the recovery program collided squarely with the most arrogant and benighted industrial leadership in the United States. On the surface the question is whether the United States Steel Corporation will recognize the union of the men who work in its coal mines. Actually, the issue is whether it will submit to what it regards as the entering wedge to unionization of the steel mills. A bitter strain of logic and consistency appears in the fact that the center of the trouble is the coal mines of the H. C. Frick Coke Company, a Steel subsidiary, for it was at Homestead, in 1889-90, that Henry Clay Frick, with the approval of his friend and partner Andrew W. Mellon, smothered the steel workers' union in its own blood. For more than forty years that tradition has been ruthlessly maintained. Now it stands in the way of the recovery program, and if Roosevelt temporizes with it or its supporters he is lost. Woodrow Wilson once found it expedient to threaten to put federal troops into the steel mills. The example may prove of value in the present situation. More recently—and in peace time—the troops have been put, as General Johnson might express it, to more louseworthy uses. I wonder whether the gallant MacArthur would display the same *élan* leading his tanks and cavalry against the properties of the Steel Corporation that he exhibited when driving the unarmed veterans and their women and children from the capital last year. But why wonder? The intrepid Chief of Staff is, as he has been at pains to explain since the B. E. F. eviction, a soldier, and has no choice but to obey orders.

* * * * *

THE attendant announces that the time grudgingly allotted me for the performance of this chore has expired. From this makeshift and feeble sortie into the field of reporting I am now compelled to return to the routine of a "patient." Perhaps I should make a show of protest—but nobody here would believe me. The treatments are soothing; the nurses are lovely and attentive; the doctors are learned and not too damned "professional." Wisdom seemed to demand that I take a count of eight, and I am taking it cheerfully. Presently I will be coming up again, and when I do I will be swinging from the floor with both hands. But for the present I am content with my warm baths and cold showers, my ping pong and stepladders.

Why Ford Workers Strike

By CARL M. MYDANS

THE real object of the strike at the Edgewater, New Jersey, plant of the Ford Motor Car Company was, of course, a wage increase. The workers seized the opportunity, however, to protest against a number of the conditions under which they had been working. These, each small in itself, had become unbearable, and the request for their amelioration was included in the workers' demands to the Ford officials.

Ford has been applauded by the outside world for the favorable conditions in his factories, but he was referred to with sullen looks and sour noises when the writer questioned the workers about these conditions. The one which the workers protested against most vehemently is the result of circumstances which they are helpless to control. A breakdown on any part of the assembly line means that they all must knock off. The moment this happens, the time is recorded and the worker's pay stops. If the tie-up is for two hours, he must work two hours longer that night. In the meantime he is not permitted to leave his station. He may not smoke, and even conversation is discouraged.

No lockers are provided for the men, and those who bring their lunch instead of eating in the Ford restaurant have no alternative but to leave their food in the washroom. It is a gamble whether or not they will find it there when the noonday gong sounds. Nor do the men have any place to leave coats and hats and other personal belongings. They are not permitted to carry them into the workroom, and it happens only too often that a man who came to work with a coat goes home without one.

Frequently production reaches a point where it is necessary to shut down early in the day. Very often this breaking-point is at noon. But the men are never advised of this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

until after they have bought and eaten their lunch at the Ford restaurant. Then they are dismissed for the day, their pay covering only those hours which they have worked.

If a man is one minute late he is docked fifteen minutes. No provision is made for a worker to leave his post at any time for any reason while the "line" is moving. It is an unfortunate day for the man who must leave for the washroom. Usually he doesn't go. But if he does, he "must run like hell and back again" and catch up on what he should have been doing. If he can't, "it is just too bad." There is supposed to be a man who can fill in in such emergencies, but he is seldom available.

A man who injures himself has indeed a problem. He must decide quickly whether or not his hurt is severe enough to warrant his running to the plant doctor. If he doesn't go, he is, of course, breaking a Ford rule. If he does, it is up to the doctor to decide whether or not the injury is bad enough to "O. K. for time" or slight enough to "deduct for time." Unless a man is badly hurt, he decides against leaving his post, for a record is kept of every injury brought to a doctor, and soon a man is accused of being "careless," a crime for which he will be fired. But a man can't be too careful, say the workers. He is forced to work fast. "Most of the guys on that line are punch drunk," one told me, "long before the end of the day."

The men are given a half-hour for lunch. They are paid twice a month—during their lunch hour. On pay days they must stand in line during this period eating their food. Those who are still in line when the 12:30 gong sounds must come back after work that night and stand in line again, or wait until the lunch hour of the following day. Ford pays his men on their time, not on his.

The workers voiced strong resentment also against the "pushers," the men hired to stand over the assembly line and shout disconcerting advice to a man whose human effort may for a moment fail to keep pace with the machine Ford has built. The "pushers" are men made hard by their job.

The sprayers have another complaint. They must get to work a quarter of an hour before the rest of the men, and are not permitted to wind up their tubes until after the line has stopped moving at night. They are on the job, they say, some thirty minutes extra each day, for which they are not paid. Yet if they are a minute late they are docked for a quarter of an hour.

When the strike broke out at the Chester, Pennsylvania, Ford plant on September 26, the Ford Motor Car Company announced that the workers were out and that the plant would not be reopened. Unrest at the New Jersey plant followed, and the workers were told that instead of the four-day week they were getting, they would be given five. But they were not to be fooled. They knew that the extra day came from work previously done at the Chester plant, which was being turned over to them. They were not going to "scab" on their fellow-workers. So they murmured, and then they struck. And the Chester boys came over to Edgewater to see that they did.

It is rumored among the Edgewater workers that Ford will close the New Jersey plant also. "If he does," they say with a determined coolness, "we will simply do what the Chester workers did. We will travel the country in mass and close every plant Ford owns." The method appears to be a pretty efficient one.

In the Driftway

IT is sometimes said that we are living today under government by decree. It is even more true that we are living under government by initial. We are ruled by the NRA, the AAA, the RFC, and a score of others. The Drifter was asked out of a clear sky the other day for the full name of the FERA. The Drifter didn't know, and he is betting 1,000 Peruvian bonds, or say $1 in gold, that nine out of ten of his hearers don't know either. He leaves you the conundrum to chew on. The correct answer will *not* appear in next week's *Nation*.

* * * * *

GOVERNMENT by initial is not, of course, a novelty growing out of the Roosevelt Administration. It appeared formidably during the World War, especially in England, which from 1914 to 1918 was as cluttered up with initials as Broadway is with ticker tape and confetti made from telephone books after Aviator Whosis has been welcomed home from his flight across Whatyoumaycallit. The English people were obliged to spend almost as much energy in hurdling initials during the war as in climbing over the barbed-wire entanglements of the Somme. Perhaps that is the purpose of initials in our recovery program. They may be intended to provide work for the unemployed.

* * * * *

PRACTICALLY all that one remembers of that great armada of World War initials is a few of the more euphonious ones—those which could be pronounced and so have remained in the memory. Perhaps the famous DORA (Defense of the Realm Act) is the best recalled today, although beside it must be placed that juicy mouthful popularized by our own doughboys, AWOL (Absent Without Official Leave). There is real reason behind the use of initials for certain Russian organizations or institutions because of the impossibility of pronouncing, or even spelling, the words in English. Some of them are wonderfully expressive besides. The OGPU, for instance, is as terrifying and implacable in sound as the Russian secret police are said to be in fact, while the NEP man of newspaper phraseology becomes a ready symbol of the New Economic Policy.

* * * * *

IN this country and time the attempt to initial the people back to prosperity is raising a problem for editors, proofreaders, and printers. To put a period after the initial or not, that is the question. The New York *Herald Tribune* insists on the old usage, and in its columns the National Recovery Administration becomes the N period, R period, A period. The New York *Times* consents to a periodless NRA, but it is not equally relenting toward the lesser fry among Mr. Roosevelt's organizations. As a weather prediction for the autumn, the Drifter would say that the period would cause periodic disturbances among the periodicals. In this connection he recalls the trouble made for the newspapers of Washington a good many years ago by a scientist in the government service by the name of McGee. He used the initials W J, but he insisted that neither of them stood

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for a name and therefore should not be followed with periods. Whenever, in recording the name, a newspaper used periods (or full stops, as printers call them) it received a letter berating and correcting it from Mr. McGee. Thus he came to be known, and eventually passed into a legend, in Washington newspaper offices as W J No-Stop McGee. There was once another man in Washington whose initials were the same as those of the present Agricultural Adjustment Administration, or AAA. He was a highly valued official of the State Department and his name was A. A. Adee. Somebody once talked with him by telephone without knowing who he was, and at the end of the conversation asked Mr. Adee to spell his name in full. "A," said Mr. Adee. "Yes," was the reply. "A," continued Mr. Adee. "I've got that; what comes next?" "A," went on Mr. Adee. "Two A's?" "Yes," replied Mr. Adee, patiently. "Well, what comes after them?" asked the other man, not so patiently. "A," said Mr. Adee, relentlessly. "Go to the devil," shot back the other man and hung up the receiver.

* * * * *

SO far as the Roosevelt Administration is concerned, the Drifter hopes it won't go on from three- and four-initial organizations to others of five or six. He thinks its initial expenditures have already been large enough, although if HSJ will manage eventually to give everybody a JOB, there will be no KICK on the part of the PEOPLE. As for the Drifter, he will stand for a good deal, but if an attempt is made to abbreviate him into a DRFTR, the person responsible will be put on the SPOT. THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

War or Peace?

TO THE EDITORS OF THE NATION:

I have just read with interest your editorial "War or Peace?" in *The Nation* of October 4. I have always been and still consider myself as good a pacifist as any, but let me ask you one or two questions. Suppose France *knows,* as many people outside of France *know,* that the Hitlerites are preparing for an *aggressive* war. What should France, what should Great Britain, do? Permit Hitler's Germany to arm to the teeth, to mobilize the entire nation from children of ten years upward, and then drag the world into a war which will cost tens of millions of victims? A war against Germany today might cost the lives of 50,000 people. A war five years from now, which would unquestionably become a world war, would cost the lives of 50,000,000 combatants, besides hundreds of millions of the civilian population. Well, pacifist as I am, I prefer a war with Germany now, today. Such a war would not only prevent a future, much more disastrous war but it would clean out Nazism, the most malignant phenomenon in history.

In the same issue with your editorial there is an article on The New Germany, in which the author says of Hitler: "He is converting Germany into a fortress bristling with hate and martial fervor. The saber rattles more loudly than under the Hohenzollern. The Nazi troopers . . . are armed with bayonets and revolvers." This is the report of everybody returning from Germany. Would you permit the twin evils of Hitlerism and militarism to grow and develop unrestrained?

New York, September 29 WILLIAM J. ROBINSON

In Reply to Mr. Stolberg

TO THE EDITORS OF THE NATION:

In the July 5 number of your publication you printed Mr. Stollberg's sprightly review of my book, "The Beginnings of Marxian Socialism in France." I shall pass over his sophomoric and supercilious attempt to grade the vast number of published monographs in any one field of interest and his general condemnation of Ph.D. dissertations, except those of two of his friends. Mr. Stolberg characterizes my book as a "slight and dull performance, neither original nor mature," and even descends to personalities, though he has never had the misfortune to meet me. I shall not quarrel with Mr. Stolberg about his tastes. But when he calls my conclusions "false," when he refers to "minor errors" twisted "into crucial blunders," I feel that he owes it to the readers of *The Nation* to prove his case. Had he devoted the two paragraphs of his harangue against "Ph. Deocracy" to an enumeration of the errors and to an analysis of the false conclusions, he would have earned the thanks of the general reader as well as of the author. Disturbed by the "disproportionately stout bibliography," Mr. Stolberg questions the veracity of the statement that my study is the first on the subject in English and even in French. He questions, without producing the name of a single work to substantiate his doubts. To be sure, "there is an immense literature on French revolutionary political and social doctrine." But what does that prove? Does the reviewer expect a student of the French revolutionary movement to neglect that literature? Does he expect the general reader to consult the vast source material of that movement? Is it not of scholarly interest, to say nothing of intrinsic value, to analyze and to synthesize this vast source material in a compact study? And what does Mr. Stolberg mean by originality? Does he, in this case, expect a new theory of social regeneration? I admit that Mr. Stolberg is a shrewd reviewer, but I confess that I do not know what he means by "glorified shrewdness."

Mr. Stolberg accuses me of "artificially delimiting Marxism to its most orthodox variety"; of maintaining that what is not strictly orthodox Marxism is not socialism. But this is misrepresentation, Mr. Stolberg. The study in question, which is only a small part of a larger work on the history of modern socialism in France, limits itself to the decade after the Commune. Its aim is to show how the mature and living doctrine of Marx—little known in France before the Commune—slowly trickled into France. That there were other socialist theories current in France before the Commune Mr. Stolberg cannot deny, for the introductory chapter of the book should have partly convinced him of that. Yet he has me contend that "what is not strictly orthodox Marxism is not socialism." How can he, the "Marxist," descend to such petty-bourgeois-liberal phraseology as: "French syndicalism is an excellent example of Marxism undergoing cultural changes under the stress of a national psychology." Only a person unacquainted with the economic and social development of France could write that.

Mr. Stolberg accredits me with saying that the Commune was not a proletarian movement, when a reading of the section on the Commune, and particularly of page 43, reveals precisely the opposite view. Furthermore, I did not dismiss Marx's famous pamphlet on the Paris Commune, as the reviewer would have us believe. A two-page analysis of its main ideas is hardly a dismissal.

One expects from Mr. Stolberg a careful and searching criticism, for he is indeed capable of writing it. Instead, his harangue leaves one wondering just how much of the book he read.

Paris, August 15 SAMUEL BERNSTEIN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To Admirers of Edward Bellamy

To the Editors of The Nation:

Edward Bellamy, though he died thirty-five years ago, visualized a social and economic scheme which is so timely that were he more widely read by the present generation, he would again sweep the country by storm, as he did when his most famous books, "Looking Backward" and "Equality," were originally published in the late eighties.

All admirers of Edward Bellamy will be happy to learn of the existence of the Edward Bellamy Association of New York (formerly the Edward Bellamy Group of Brooklyn), P. O. Box 484, Grand Central Annex, New York. This organization is strictly non-partisan and non-commercial.

The Edward Bellamy Association of New York

New York, September 14

Farming and the Jobless

To the Editors of The Nation:

We are very much interested in what is being done this year to promote an interest in agriculture on the part of young people, particularly in connection with farming projects in urban communities for the unemployed. We shall appreciate hearing from any group conducting courses in agriculture or farming projects.

New York, September 19 Janet G. Weisman

For a Twin-City Group

To the Editors of The Nation:

All young men and women living in the twin cities who are interested in the discussion, from the liberal and radical point of view, of current political, economic, literary, and general problems are urged to write to me at 1335 Penn Avenue North, Minneapolis, for the purpose of forming a group.

Minneapolis, Minn., September 25 Louis Ostrin

Finance

Wall Street at the Wailing Wall

WALL STREET'S wailing against the securities act is mounting in a carefully controlled crescendo which will reach its fortissimo just as Congress meets in January. The Street's chameleon cloak, designed for public appearances, has passed into its third transition within a year and half. From the arrogant, swashbuckling cavalier's cape which was flaunted before the Senate began its investigation of Wall Street practices in April, 1932, from the somber robes of the penitent and reformed sinner assumed with the start of the New Deal, the Street's disguise has now shifted to the mourning shawl of the despondent patriot, weeping that the flow of new capital essential for national business recovery should be stifled by what is described in financial circles as "well-intentioned but ill-considered" legislation.

The Wall Street dirge was solemnly intoned at the convention of the Financial Advertisers' Association in September, certainly the most receptive audience in the world for subversive propaganda against the securities act. At that time spokesmen for Wall Street described in the direst terms the catastrophes that would result if the act were not drastically amended, declared that the act had put a complete stop to new financing by important concerns, and intimated that it would cause wholesale defaults on funded debts with fatal repercussions on the credit structure of the nation. In this lamentation the role of Jeremiah was taken by Arthur H. Dean of the Wall Street law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell, who is now preparing a series of proposed amendments to the act which will be submitted to bankers and corporation counsel throughout the country preparatory to the descent on Congress. Mr. Dean has summed up his own attitude toward the act as follows: "With the purpose of the act, that is, the protection of the public against fraudulent securities, the writer is in full sympathy, but it seems hardly necessary to burn down the house to exterminate vermin." (One wonders whom he considers the vermin.) But notice how smoothly he slides by the main point—as if the experience of the past decade had not demonstrated conclusively that mere safeguards against demonstrable fraud are entirely inadequate protection for the investing public against the guile of Wall Street.

Those unfortunate investors who intrusted their savings to South American bond issues, sold with all the majestic trappings and ostentatious ballyhoo of Wall Street, might suspect a very personal basis for Mr. Dean's displeasure that liability in the securities business should be extended beyond the simple limits of fraud as defined in the common law. For Mr. Dean's firm of Sullivan and Cromwell was right at the heart of the Latin American bond racket; its name was affixed to many of the issuing circulars for these bonds, assuring the investor that all legal details had the approval of this august authority. There was an issue of $42,500,000 of 6 per cent bonds of the Republic of Chile, sold in October, 1926, which is now in default and sells for 8 per cent of par. There was an issue of $24,000,000 of 7 per cent bonds of the Province of Buenos Aires, sold in December, 1926, which is now in partial default. There was an issue of $41,100,000 of 6 per cent bonds of this same province, sold in February, 1928, which is now priced at 38. There was approximately $18,000,000 more of bonds of this province—all sold with the stamp of Sullivan and Cromwell's approval. There was another block of $27,500,000 of bonds of the Republic of Chile sold in February, 1927, in default since August, 1931, and now selling at 8. There was a $15,000,000 Chilean consolidated municipal loan sold with the legal blessing of Sullivan and Cromwell in 1929, in default since March, 1932, and now selling at 6 per cent of par. There was $25,000,000 of 6 per cent bonds of the Republic of Colombia, now in partial default and selling at 36.

The name of Sullivan and Cromwell is also associated with the financing activities of Goldman Sachs and Company, carried out in the later stages of the stock-market boom. In December, 1928, Sullivan and Cromwell passed on the legality of the initial issue of 1,000,000 shares of the Goldman Sachs Trading Corporation, sold to the public by Goldman Sachs for $104,000,000. At the time of the market's low point in 1932 the market value of these original shares was little more than $2,000,000 and the value of all the assets of the corporation had shrunk from $329,000,000 early in 1929 to $33,700,000 at the end of 1932. Furthermore, Sullivan and Cromwell were regularly associated with the trading corporation as its counsel, and as such were familiar with the details of management which were later carried into the courts in suits by stockholders alleging mismanagement.

The firm's name also appeared on the offering circulars for the Blue Ridge Corporation and the Shenandoah Corpora-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, affiliates of the Goldman Sachs Trading Corporation, which were floated in the summer of 1929. Not only were Sullivan and Cromwell counsel for these two concerns, but John Foster Dulles, one of the partners, was a director in both. The public investment in Shenandoah was about $67,500,000, subscribed in July, 1929, for 1,000,000 shares of 6 per cent preference stock at 50 and for 1,000,000 shares of common at 17½. In 1932 the preferred stock sold at 4½ and the common at ⅜, while the value of the assets of the corporation had depreciated from $165,000,000 to $9,300,000. In the Blue Ridge Corporation the public bought 1,000,000 preference shares at 51½ and 1,000,000 common shares at $20 a share. By 1932 the preferred had dropped to 16½ and the common to 50 cents a share.

Another dubious "security" with which Sullivan and Cromwell were associated in a legal capacity was the Prince and Whitely Trading Corporation, now known as the Phoenix Securities Corporation. The public was let in on this on September 5, 1929, exactly at the peak of boom stock prices, paying $24,600,000 for 328,000 shares of preferred and 650,000 shares of common. By 1932 the preferred was selling at 8, and the common at 25 cents, while the net assets of the corporation had depreciated to $3,200,000. One can understand why Mr. Dean shudders at a law which offers recourse to so many investors against the sellers of such "securities."

The sappers and miners against the act employ the familiar Wall Street strategy of befogging the main issue by raising "practical" objections. The reasoning behind these tactics is clear: if enough changes can be secured on the ground of "practical" requirements rather than of open opposition to the underlying theory, then the act will be sufficiently emasculated to make its theory unembarrassing to Wall Street. But now, of all times, when the whole question of effective regulation of securities is at stake, the main issue should be unobscured. The main issue is that Wall Street is reluctant—and for the time being refuses—to accept responsibilities which it should long ago have accepted as its established practice. It is laughable that business men and financiers, whose boast is always of the accurate and factual basis for all their operations, should now cry havoc before a law which merely requires them to stand behind this accuracy and these facts when they are offered as the basis for securities.

Despite all the talk of defaults in connection with the act, there has as yet been no important bond maturity since the act became effective in July. Consequently, its real influence on refunding operations has yet to be demonstrated. On the other hand, it is true that new corporate bond issues have been at a standstill and that no important established concern—other than investment trusts—has attempted new financing of any character under the act's provisions. In the absence of maturities a large part of this lag can be accounted for by the low level of business and by the fact that plants built to accommodate a 1929 volume of business are more than adequate for current demands. However, to the extent that financing which otherwise might have been attempted has failed to materialize, Wall Street has gone on strike against the securities act.

This strike, veiled in a cloak of patriotism, is the bludgeon which Wall Street will hold over the head of Congress and the Administration to compel the desired "practical" modifications of the act. It is a threat which will require all the support of seekers after honesty in securities to counteract, but which, if pushed too far, might prove a two-edged sword to Wall Street, should the government be forced to take a direct hand in corporate financing. Meanwhile, there is widespread confidence in the Street that by next spring there will be a changed securities act which will permit business to be conducted much as in the past, along the old lines of public exploitation without bothersome responsibilities.

PETER HELMOOP NOYES

Henry Hazlitt
new editor of
The American Mercury
and author of
The Anatomy of Criticism

WE are proud to be the publishers of Henry Hazlitt's first book in eleven years: *The Anatomy of Criticism.*

This book will give the readers of The American Mercury an excellent opportunity to analyze the temper and opinion of their new editor. We believe that a reading of *The Anatomy of Criticism** will cause readers of the Mercury to look forward with as much relish as ever to each new monthly issue.

—*Simon and Schuster, Inc.*

**$2.00 Everywhere*

The Nation's
RADIO HOUR

Every Wednesday evening
at 8:15

over Station W.E.V.D.
1300 k.—231 m.

October 25th
OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD
"The Vital Mayoralty Issue"

When writing to advertisers please mention **The Nation**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books, Films, Drama

A Dialogue of Self and Soul*

By W. B. YEATS

I

My Soul. I summon to the winding ancient stair;
Set all your mind upon the steep ascent,
Upon the broken, crumbling battlement,
Upon the breathless starlit air,
Upon the star that marks the hidden pole;
Fix every wandering thought upon
That quarter where all thought is done:
Who can distinguish darkness from the soul?

My Self. The consecrated blade upon my knees
Is Sato's ancient blade, still as it was,
Still razor-keen, still like a looking-glass
Unspotted by the centuries;
That flowering, silken, old embroidery, torn
From some court-lady's dress and round
The wooden scabbard bound and wound,
Can, tattered, still protect, faded adorn.

My Soul. Why should the imagination of a man
Long past his prime remember things that are
Emblematical of love and war?
Think of ancestral night that can,
If but imagination scorn the earth
And intellect its wandering
To this and that and t'other thing,
Deliver from the crime of death and birth.

My Self. Montashigi, third of his family, fashioned it
Five hundred years ago, about it lie
Flowers from I know not what embroidery—
Heart's purple—and all these I set
For emblems of the day against the tower
Emblematical of the night,
And claim as by a soldier's right
A charter to commit the crime once more.

My Soul. Such fulness in that quarter overflows
And falls into the basin of the mind
That man is stricken deaf and dumb and blind,
For intellect no longer knows
Is from the *Ought,* or *Knower* from the *Known*—
That is to say, ascends to heaven;
Only the dead can be forgiven;
But when I think of that my tongue's a stone.

II

My Self. A living man is blind and drinks his drop.
What matter if the ditches are impure?
What matter if I live it all once more?
Endure that toil of growing up;
The ignominy of boyhood; the distress
Of boyhood changing into man;
The unfinished man and his pain
Brought face to face with his own clumsiness;

The finished man among his enemies?—
How in the name of heaven can he escape
That defiling and disfigured shape
The mirror of malicious eyes
Casts upon his eyes until at last
He thinks that shape must be his shape?
And what's the good of an escape
If honor find him in the wintry blast?

I am content to live it all again
And yet again, if it be life to pitch
Into the frog-spawn of a blind man's ditch,
A blind man battering blind men;
Or into that most fecund ditch of all,
The folly that man does
Or must suffer, if he woos
A proud woman not kindred of his soul.

I am content to follow to its source
Every event in action or in thought;
Measure the lot; forgive myself the lot!
When such as I cast out remorse
So great a sweetness flows into the breast
We must laugh and we must sing,
We are blest by everything,
Everything we look upon is blest.

* Reprinted from "The Winding Stair and Other Poems," copyright by the Macmillan Company, to be published October 24. By permission of the publishers, the Macmillan Company.

American Politics

Government of the People: A Study in the American Political System. By D. W. Brogan. Harper and Brothers. $4.

MR. BROGAN is one of the associates of Professor Harold J. Laski at the London School of Economics and Political Science. His book is remarkable for two things, the first being its probably unexampled display of precise knowledge in its field, and the second being its tolerant and philosophical air. The facts that the author has to set forth are, in large part, unpleasant and even shocking, for politics in America is almost a monopoly of professionally dishonest and dishonorable men, but there is no snuffling here over their villainies, and no vain attempt to show that they are worse than their colleagues of other lands. Both in his preface and in his conclusion Mr. Brogan apologizes for what may seem to be the unrelieved gloom of his narrative. There is more to government, he recalls, than mere politics, and it is well to bear in mind that the same camorra of fools and rogues which produced Teapot Dome also managed, by some unfathomable magic, to produce the Bureau of Standards.

Professor Laski, in a foreword, says that Mr. Brogan's book is "the most illuminating treatise on American government since the late Lord Bryce's." This is quite true, but it probably does not go far enough. Bryce, for all his curiosity about politics, kept himself in a kind of cloister, at least from the neck down, all his life, and in consequence his famous monograph shows something of the academic aloofness of Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell's "Government of England." It describes, adequately enough, what goes on (or at least what was going on at the time it was written), but it leaves the motive behind the overt act obscure, and often neglects the personality behind

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the motive altogether. Mr. Brogan is never guilty of that muddiness. He is a scholar, but he is also, I take it, an Irishman, and to an Irishman, however learned, politics can never be a conflict of merely moral forces; it is always and inevitably a combat between concrete human beings, Pat and Mike.

But Irishman or not, it is amazing that a foreigner, however frequent his visits to the United States, should have won his way so far into the dark backward and abysm of our politics. I can recall no work of native authorship that sets forth the essential facts more accurately, or more copiously. All the treatises on politics that we produce at home fall into two classes. The first consists of monographs by university pundits who have everything at third or fourth hand, and only too often show it in both their premises and their conclusions—the late Woodrow Wilson's "Congressional Government" offers a good example; and the second consists of books by men who, though they have actually been to the front—reformed Senators and Congressmen, retired Cabinet officers, literate Washington correspondents, etc.—make it clear in every line that they have too little historical sense and information to know what the war was about. Mr. Brogan manages to gather in the virtues of both classes without taking on any of their vices. He makes an occasional slip but not many, and he reveals a pleasant and plentiful skepticism about what is generally believed—for example, that city politicians are crookeder than their country colleagues, and that the late Warren Gamaliel Harding was nominated by the black art of the late Colonel Harvey, LL.D.

His conclusions are somewhat damaged by the fact that the speed of American history has been advanced from that of a dance marathon to that of a skyrocket since he finished his labors last February. Many of the changes that he could then discuss only as remote possibilities are already in full force and effect, to the edification of men and angels—for example, the vast augmentation of the power of the federal executive, and especially of the President. Others, though they have not been proclaimed, nor even seriously projected, are creeping in as facts—for example, the abolition of the Supreme Court's right of veto in economic matters. Mr. Brogan, in general, is inclined to approve all such reforms. He believes that the best way to combat the spoils system, which is manifestly the chief curse of American government, is to whittle away the prerogatives of the State, city, and county politicians. That we are headed in this direction seems probable, but that a Farley unassisted would do much better than a Farley beset by local sub-Farleys and the Senatorial prerogative is not so sure; indeed, he might do worse.

Mr. Brogan gives over an interesting chapter to speculating about the future course of the Democratic Party, which was triumphant when he wrote but had not actually ensnouted the trough. Obviously, it may head in either one of two directions. On the one hand, it may try to come to terms with the Eastern money boys, and so complete the wreck of the Republicans by stealing both their metaphysic and their fat cats; and on the other hand it may follow the Western agrarians and silver men into genuine radicalism. Mr. Brogan apparently believes that it will try, characteristically, to do both, and that it will come to grief in consequence. This is probably a sound guess. The chief vice of the Democratic Party, as everyone knows, is suicide: it is forever swallowing handfuls of bichloride tablets or cutting its own throat. Did it come into the world with nine lives? Then seven of them have been shed to date, and maybe eight.

Mr. Brogan argues very plausibly that the prospects for a new radical party in the United States were never better than they are today. The cutting off of immigration has let the proud Anglo-Saxon into the ditch, and soon or late he must discover that the independent and lucrative filling-station or hot-dog stand that he dreams of will never take material shape. "Baseless hope is the last infirmity of feeble minds, but the power of self-deception must have a limit." True enough, but are we near that limit now? I presume to doubt it. The Americano, in the not too distant future, may see at last that he has been fooled, but that will hardly save him from being fooled again. Mr. Brogan, I think, greatly underestimates the virtuosity of American politicians in this department. If he had waited six or eight months before closing his book he'd have had some new and unparalleled masterpieces to record.

He deserves to be read, for he is a man of curiously wide and sound information, and his discussion of the facts he sets forth is nearly always sensible. There is little of the theorist in him; he is interested mainly, not in what might be or ought to be, but in what is. Moreover, he writes amusingly, with many a shrewd wink and pawky phrase. A really complete autopsy, carried on in strict accord with the Virchovian canon, would require far more than one volume, however fat, but within his limits Mr. Brogan has done a very competent job.

H. L. Mencken

Ruskin: A Career of Error

John Ruskin. An Introduction to Further Study of His Life and Work. By R. H. Wilenski. Frederick Stokes. $4.50.

FEW men of genius have been so monumentally wrong as John Ruskin. The title and preface of his first book indicate the arrogance and unreliability of statement that were to mark his whole career. The title read: "Modern Painters: Their Superiority in the Art of Landscape Painting to all the Ancient Masters, Proved by Examples of the True, the Beautiful, and the Intellectual from the Works of Modern Artists . . ." The author's claim in the preface that—at twenty-three—he had a practically complete acquaintance with "all the ancient masters" is shown by Mr. Wilenski to be quite unbased. His attack on the earliest seedling of modern architecture, the Crystal Palace, his belief that the beauty of a building lay in its applied decoration, his support of Napoleon III, his vilification of Whistler, his hysterical denunciations of machinery, are but the better-known incidents in a long career of error.

But Ruskin was never entirely wrong. He made no virtue of consistency and he did not develop his ideas in a straight line; he was constantly doubling back on himself in contradiction. As Mr. Wilenski says, "Ruskin calendars can be compiled by Tories, Fascists, and Communists, by photographic painters and cubist artists, by chauvinists and pacifists, by parsons and agnostics." For every brilliant insight he had an insular prejudice; for every cruel and stupid thought—and he had many—he had a liberating insight; and the same subject could call forth from him both wisdom and drivel. In short, he is one of the most perplexing personalities in English literature and he offers a standing challenge to the critic to find the "key" to his thirty-nine large volumes of self-contradiction.

In his careful and perspicacious study, Mr. Wilenski meets that challenge with the hypothesis of a "true" and a "false" Ruskin. The true Ruskin uttered opinions with which a civilized modern, not puritanical in ethics, not literalistic in art, a liberal or a radical in politics, would agree. But Ruskin was a mental invalid; his malady eventually brought him to madness. During his active life it imposed upon him aberrant states of which the most notable were manic periods in which he desired—and assumed—absolute wisdom and Godlike power. In these states he uttered the nonsense of the "false" Ruskin.

There is, of course, no doubt that Ruskin was the prey of mental disease. And there is no doubt that much of his nonsense arises from the ascendancy of the pathological states. But

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his manic tendency was surely as productive of his deep insights as of his shallow falsities. Ruskin was probably psychotic, as Mr. Wilenski implies; but he was also neurotic—that is, he had a mental malady which was the result of conflict. This conflict, the result of Ruskin's training by his parents, which was in many ways representative of the society of his time, not only made Ruskin mentally ill but also determined the content of his mind. This aspect of Ruskin's psychological condition Mr. Wilenski largely ignores.

The "key" to Ruskin lies, I believe, in a broader method of comprehension than Mr. Wilenski has used. What Ruskin accomplished was to place the whole of human activity in a great organic synthesis: art, science, religion, morality become in that synthesis integrally related to one another within the integrating social order. Ruskin's individual perceptions within this synthesis were frequently wrong. On the other hand, some of his perceptions are exciting in their truth and originality. Although I cannot feel with Mr. Wilenski that "Unto This Last" and "Munera Pulveris" represent the "true Ruskin," they certainly represent the truth in Ruskin. Here, working alone—for he seems not to have read any radical economists—he attacked the assumptions of the classical "scientific" economists, showed the fallacies of the Economic Man, of laissez faire, of current theories of value, and reared a structure of social realism that the generality of economic theorists have yet to equal.

LIONEL TRILLING

The Swiss Family Borsodi

Flight from the City. By Ralph Borsodi. Harper and Brothers. $2.50.

The Promise of Power. By Stuart Chase. John Day Pamphlets No. 32. The John Day Company. 25 cents.

THE homesteading experiences of the Borsodi family are quite entertaining. Compared with almost any urban existence, their life seems interesting, healthy, satisfactory, and pleasant in the extreme. The reader is stimulated to a sort of mental competition in ingenuity, matching his wits and potential skill with Mr. and Mrs. Borsodi, and thinking how good *he* would be at inventing new and productive economies and perfecting this or that labor-saving dodge. The book documents what is at once the most romantic and the most concrete fulfilment to date of that vague ideal of landed self-sufficiency which has been bothering the American intelligentsia—and raising the value of Connecticut real estate—with such cumulative vigor.

If Mr. Borsodi had confined himself to concrete descriptions of the technique of farming, canning, house-building, furniture-making, flour-grinding, and weaving, and had perhaps included a few more specific data on time-schedules and budgets, this would have been a better book than it is and would incidentally not need to be subjected to any such exhaustive criticism as the present one. But the author's enthusiasm and his obviously sincere desire to make others as happy as he is himself make "Flight from the City," in its wider prescriptions and implications, an exceedingly dangerous and even a dishonest piece of propaganda. The descriptions and the order blanks do not refer to the same article.

The pictures of homesteading life—of a busy, efficient, many-sided, "secure," and rich existence in the country—refer to the experience of the Borsodis. Very few figures are given which would indicate exactly how large a reliable cash income one needs for such an existence, but it must be considerable. The Borsodis have one or two servants, they probably have a car, their power-consumption is high, and their investment in productive and labor-saving machinery must by now be rather large. Not counting extras for education, travel, and doctors' bills, and not including interest on the capital investment, they must require a regular income of at least $2,000 or $2,500. Meanwhile, as they adhere strictly to the sensible principle of never producing anything for sale, all their solid and continuous labor on the homestead does not bring in one cent of cash.

Such an economic scheme can in no sense be called "self-sufficiency"—unless one premises that one member of every family receive a regular cash income from some source not requiring either his regular presence in town or any very arduous labor at home. To achieve permanently this type of "freedom," you must be a *rentier* whose income is insured against depression, bank failure, and revolution, or, better, a successful writer who does not need libraries, or, best of all, Mr. Borsodi himself. In addition, you must have a husky wife with a positive taste for domestic production, no desire to do anything else with her time, and a gift for home education as well; you and your whole family must have few outside social impulses and a distinct physical and mental aptitude for all sorts of experimentation; you must be able to enjoy the varied and continued responsibility of owning and planning and directing and repairing fields, gardens, live stock, machines, and an entire domestic economy; and, finally, you must be actively convinced that schools, colleges, theaters, lectures, libraries, museums, art galleries, concerts, automobiles, doctors, dentists, hospitals, travel, leisure, and most forms of social intercourse or communal recreation belong to a world well lost.

However, even if one grants that if you are the Borsodis you *can* be relatively secure on an isolated homestead, this book is intended to have a much wider implication, and for quite a different group from that classified above. Mr. Borsodi is prescribing for the unemployed, for destitute urban families now in receipt of a dole. And already the city of Dayton, Ohio, has plans for setting up some 2,000 families on three-acre farms, in homestead units of some forty families each. Some of the financial and planning features of this experiment are interesting enough—the units will encircle the town within a radius of fifteen miles, and the land of each homestead unit will remain in single ownership—and one must wish it all possible good luck. But the essential dishonesty of this book lies in the fact that while the reader is shown extremely low figures as the price of doing all this, he is at the same time led to believe that the 2,000 families will be able to have the same pleasant, secure existence as the Borsodis—which is just not true.

In the first place, none of these families will have any capital to invest at the start, and even the absolutely minimum capital lent by the city will require some $30 a month cash by way of interest. More cash, even with an irreducible minimum of leisure, comfort, convenience, and personal choice of occupation on the part of the homesteaders, would be absolutely necessary for such things as power, shoes, medicine, transportation, replacement of machinery, and those many essential food items and raw materials which absolutely cannot be produced at home. Electric power is a fine thing, and it is the very cornerstone of Mr. Borsodi's idea, but it costs money. Mr. Borsodi does not say what his power costs him, but Stuart Chase in his pamphlet happens to mention that the electricity to run *his* homestead costs $17 per month. Say $50 a month cash as an absolute minimum of income for these homesteaders, for *Existenzminimum,* with a degree of amenity and convenience and leisure in no way comparable to that enjoyed by the Borsodis.

Fifty dollars a month! Where will it come from? Mr. Borsodi acknowledges the necessity of an outside income, but he offers no very clear idea of what may be its source, beyond the negative statement that the amount required is less than the cost of decent relief. Will the city of Dayton pay this sum out of sheer gratitude for having its slums emptied? (I am not saying that it *should* not, but will it?) And how can any-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one call a family needing $50 a month in cash, and living fifteen miles from town on a farm which produces nothing for sale, "secure," or living "off the land"?

"Some member of the family will work in town," is, I suppose, the implied answer. But that immediately involves regular and speedy transportation, good roads and higher taxes, and the existence of a regular job not requiring too much waiting around, hunting down, or personal availability on the part of the applicant. It is also necessary that the job provide a very decent wage for short working hours, and that the worker be tractable to the idea of giving up all or most of his wages for the privilege of living far away from work and probably doing some weeding and farm work in his off hours as well.

My guess is that most poor families would be quite justified in being willing to sacrifice something in the quality of their food and surroundings rather than be quite as hopelessly insecure as all that. Clearly, there is no receipt for a millennium here, even without going into the fundamental contradictions in the larger picture—which he does not hesitate to offer as a plausible one—of a society which has followed Mr. Borsodi's advice en masse: millions of individual families devoting all their time and energy to home production for home consumption by means of the cheap materials, cheap machinery, and cheap power which only a highly organized mass-production economy can provide. When all is said, what used to be true is still true now, in spite of the Borsodis. A homesteader must either be able to raise cash crops on which he can make a reliable profit, or he must have a regular and safe cash income from some extraneous source not demanding regular concentrated work on his part—or he must be satisfied to be a hand-to-mouth peasant, with a shack on a stony hillside, a wooden plow, a potato patch, and a level of existence somewhat lower than that of the city slum-dweller.

Well, what *is* to be done about it? Mr. Borsodi's initial thesis, that at present and under ordinary conditions neither the city *nor* the country provides satisfactory living conditions, is beyond argument. It is proved by census figures alone. In 1926, 2,334,000 people left the farms for the cities, and in the same year 1,427,000 left the cities for the farms. By 1932 this movement was about equal in both directions. In 1932 about a million left farms for cities, and more than a million and a half went back to the farms. This does not prove that we are a permanently migratory people, but it does prove that so far we have not been clever enough to make ourselves a satisfactory environment.

The primary ingredients in Mr. Borsodi's argument are also part of the thesis of Stuart Chase's little pamphlet, "The Promise of Power." These are (1) that distribution costs account for a terrific burden of waste under the present industrial system, and often more than make up for the economies of mass production; and (2) that the widespread transmission of electricity is the most important single factor with which the planner of the new social environment and of a more efficient industrial economy has to work. That these are fundamental facts accounts for most of what is truth or partial truth in either publication.

"The Promise of Power" says nothing very new, leaves out some of the most important things that have been said before, and makes a few generalizations which one feels that Mr. Chase could not have amplified without getting into difficulties—or at least without saying a few things newer, more important, and more dangerous than what he did say. But still, the facts he brings up are so important that they cannot be mentioned too often. Electric transmission and cheap power might be the vital ingredients in a new world—a world in which the congested megalopolis and the pauperized rural slum may alike disappear; in which automatic manufacturing and remote control may change the typical industrial worker from a robot to a competent engineer; in which power is cheaper to move than bulk products and in which, therefore, huge factories and enormous, wasteful urban agglomerations may be outmoded, and a better distribution of population along regional land-economic lines made possible; in which newly planned regional centers may provide facilities for the productive use of leisure, *plus* regular short-time employment and a reliable cash income.

But Mr. Chase makes it all sound suspiciously easy, just as easy and just as suspect as Mr. Borsodi's visualization of the self-sufficient good life. It is all too Swiss Family Robinson. Perhaps what is wrong is best indicated by the recurrence of such sentences as the following: "Electricity can give us universally high standards of living, new and amusing kinds of jobs, leisure, freedom, an end to drudgery, congestion, noise, smoke, and filth. It can overcome most of the objections and problems of a steam-engine civilization."

But *electricity* cannot do a single one of these things. Electricity is merely a tool in the hands of those who choose how and where and why they shall use it. All the decisions, all the motivating power to change, all the plans, all the notions as to what a standard of living is or might be, must unfortunately come from *us* and not from electricity. It should be a truism, but one must say it over and over: the mere existence of a means in no way premises the achievement of an end. The fact that in the long run and in the widest human sense the full use of electricity to make a new social pattern would be "economic," does not in any way prove that the coal and railroad age in general, or the knot of vested interests which is New York, or Chicago, or Pittsburgh, in particular, will give a polite bow to "progress" and quietly lie down and die. To believe any such thing is to betray as fallacious and romantic a faith in the existence of a "free," competitive economy advancing willy-nilly toward Utopia as ever was held by any nineteenth-century free-trader.

No, one thing is certain. Planning—an economy in which we only get what we have sense enough to want and work for—is what we have, and planning is what we will have. But the mere fact that we have shown ourselves much more tractable to the idea of planned control than could have been expected does not of itself constitute an unqualified step ahead. It is too often forgotten that "planning" is an amoral word referring to a method, and is not a synonym for either "scientific progress" or "social betterment." There are two mutually opposed kinds of planning, one positive and the other negative, one progressive and the other retrogressive.

One is the kind of which we have had more than a taste already, with a strong threat of more to come, the sort of planning whose purpose, avowed or not, is to bolster up and intrench existing investments—in railroads, in urban land values, in megalopolitan congestion—without regard to their use or value to society as a whole, and at the expense of new forces working in the opposite direction. This is the kind of "planning" which eventually brought about the downfall of most historic civilizations, from Roman capitalism to medieval guild socialism.

The other kind of planning postulates not current interests and values, not present capital equipment, but a real standard of living, real resources—power, materials, land, people—and real technical possibilities and facilities. The policy of this sort of planning must inevitably be to cut down, not to bolster up, the outworn structure which stands in its way.

In a list of the things which power "is accomplishing, or helps to make possible," Mr. Chase's point number 8 is the following: "The collapse of the old unionism and of outgrown theories of class struggle." Beyond this negative remark there is no mention of the means toward electrified bliss. Such a generalization is no doubt very comforting to the *Fortune* audience for whom the article was originally written. It will make

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many of our enlightened business men feel more enlightened than ever. But if that is all there is to be said on the score of social struggles, with reference to whether or not the "promise of power" will be fulfilled, then we may as well resign ourselves to meeting the neotechnic age only in heaven.

It may be quite true that the old unionism has collapsed. It is probably also true that the line-up of "classes" which is to decide which form of planning will hold sway has not yet been clearly drawn, and that whatever it is, it may well not be along purely nineteenth-century Marxist lines. But struggle there must be, with a functional economy, a classless society, and a socialized means of production as the goal on one side, and the preservation of existing "values" and interests on the other. For what does the full and economic use of electricity, the "promise of power," imply? It implies writing off almost the entire present investment in cities, in means of transportation, in real estate, in factories and equipment. It implies the power, without any intervening period of individual exploitation or speculation in land and resources, to set up complete new communities, to say what industries shall be located in each and where they shall be placed, to plan their wage scales and periods of operation in the interests of the consumers and the workers, to lay out and construct facilities for residence, education, and recreation in one operation, for permanent use value and not for profit.

If anyone thinks that this can be accomplished without the active participation of a very large, well-disciplined, and well-organized group of people who know exactly what they want and want it enough to be willing to die in the process of getting it; if anyone thinks that the "promise of power," a "flight from the city" to something definitely better, or any real "security" can be achieved without a definite and clear-cut social struggle, he is no worthy candidate even for literary leadership.

CATHERINE BAUER

A Blithe Disciple

Many Happy Returns. By Richard Strachey. Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.50.

LET those who read the first lines of this effervescent book not be put off: there is much more to come than was ever known in Peter Pan's philosophy. Woolf, Joyce, and Proust were the godparents who presided at this christening, and one of the many interests aroused by Mr. Strachey's spirited, sophisticated, devil-may-care book is the light it sheds on its forerunners. For Mr. Strachey is word-intoxicated. He drips words, he pirouettes with words, he dances with words, and dancing with words he turns the corner of the long, long trail and brings us back again into the company of the word-intoxicated Dickens and the word-intoxicated Thackeray. And gusty, lusty English prose asserts its Englishness again, and we are as far away from the sober Russian and the sober French approach to subject matter as we were before Arnold Bennett gave us "The Old Wives' Tale." Ironically the man who helped Mr. Strachey turn the corner is the one who gave us "Dubliners" and "The Portrait of the Artist," who then, having pondered too long over words, turned and rent the comely limbs of English prose, and held up to savage display every drop of ink that had crept into its veins, and who finally took the dictionary apart and pelted his readers with its leaves. And if Mr. Strachey's pirouetting were to be taken as a spoof on Mr. Joyce, it would be a very pretty spoof.

But it is not a spoof, it is an "ironic comedy" of modern life. And in spite of its Peter Pannish introduction, which is part of Mr. Strachey's irony, it should be much read, because it flirts delightfully with Vice. Nor does it carry on this *amour*

THE MODERN THINKER MUST speak another language

THE world is growing smaller! Scientific miracles of land and air bring the ends of the earth closer together everyday.

The world is your neighbor! The Spaniard is in your back yard. Paris is across the street. And Moscow is around the corner. Can you speak to your neighbor?

At a recent gathering in the interests of world peace, four eminent speakers delivered historic addresses, in their native tongues. Would you have been at home in that assemblage?

The modern man and women *must* speak another language, in order to *feel* and understand the thrilling pageant which the twentieth century is unfolding.

Begin now! Learn to speak French, Russian, Spanish, German, Italian, or anyone of 23 living languages, by the new LINGUAPHONE METHOD . . . You will be amazed how quickly and easily you can learn a new language at home by this unique method.

7 Day Free Trial

Follow the language of your choice for a few minutes a day for 7 days. Unless you are delighted and convinced you pay nothing. Put Linguaphone to the test in your own home at our expense.

Send for Free Book

Use the coupon below to get our 32-page illustrated story of this world-famous language method, created by 150 foremost educators and used in over 11,500 universities and schools through the world.

LINGUAPHONE COURSES

RUSSIAN	FRENCH	ITALIAN
GERMAN	SPANISH	POLISH
SWEDISH	DUTCH	IRISH
AFRIKAANS	ENGLISH	CHINESE
LATIN	GREEK	PERSIAN
JAPANESE	ESPERANTO	BENGALI

Call for Free Demonstration at Our New Audition Salon

LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
8, Rockefeller Plaza, Rockefeller Center
New York City Tel: CIrcle 7-0831

LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
8, Rockefeller Center, New York

Without cost or obligation please send me your free 32-page book (SD) and complete details of your Free Trial Offer.

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... State.....

I wish to speak.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the mysterious, awed, horrendous way of Proust, who follows it gropingly through a labyrinth of caves, each one darker and more gruesome than the one before. Mr. Strachey observes Vice with a light-hearted smile. His hero, who is a dazzling, smart young man, admired equally by charwomen, publicans, intellectuals, Peter Pannish Victorians, Young Men and Women of the World, and Mr. Strachey, welcomes his brother's lover as a fairy fay, gaily and without reproof. And his heroine, in a moment of twentieth-century penance, submits herself to the caresses of a human gorilla who makes Charlus look like a lily. It is all very gay and all very clever, and it ends on a note of wholesome hope. ALICE BEAL PARSONS

Shorter Notices

Blossoming Antlers. By Winifred Welles. The Viking Press. $1.

Winifred Welles comes near to writing poetry of importance. She has a unique command of words, a fine sense of rhythm, a very individual approach to her materials. Just why she does not attain undeniable greatness it is difficult to say. Perhaps it is because, in spite of the equipment, the seeing eyes, of a mystic, she lacks the mystic's intensity and conviction. Her sphere of reference is the physical beauty of nature. Her peculiar insight compels her to describe the scene, the bird, the flower in their most delicate aspect. The result is a fine imagery, never usual, always special. The physical world here is reduced to thin, delicate lines. It therefore lacks bold color, dramatic design.

> Fragile as glass my slender tool would break
> On those superb designs of suffering,
> Bronze Cross and blazing Crown—I only make
> The sensitive, faint silver of a wing.

It gains a sensitive, almost perilous awareness. Miss Welles's muse is feminine in the best sense of that often misused adjective. But in this world of hers, which is not entirely unlike De La Mare's, the poet is not nostalgic. In these descriptions, which are sometimes as carefully carved as were Elinor Wylie's, Miss Welles hints at no hidden violence or arrogance. Writing with something of the wit of the metaphysical poets—and more like Herrick than like Donne—this modern woman poet is neither the skeptic to whom the odd comparison is necessary nor quite the mystic who must relate opposites. She commands words; they do her bidding. She never falls into the commonplace image or the ordinary statement of feeling. Her poetic sensibilities are never wrong. The trouble is that they almost never contribute to any larger conception or passion. They exist for their own sake. Microscopic, brittle, delicate details, but no broad outline here, no faith, no fixed poetic philosophy, no large perspective.

Modern Industrial Organization: An Economic Interpretation. By Herbert von Beckerath. Translated by Robinson Newcomb and Franziska Krebs. McGraw-Hill Book Company. $4.

Dr. von Beckerath's basic assumption is that business has a mystical destiny of its own which seems to be "permanent profitableness" as contrasted with the narrow private interests of investors, workers, and consumers and with social-welfare attitudes. His analysis is largely general, although there are numerous references to specific countries, especially to Germany. It covers internal problems of enterprises, the "objectification" of business policy, conflicts of investors and managers, the influence of various markets on industrial structure, and the growth of cartels, syndicates, and combines to adjust plant requirements to markets controlled to maintain profits. The discussion of the types, methods, evasions, and degree of effectiveness of cartels, as well as of their relation to vertical and horizontal combinations and to monopoly, is especially interesting. Dr. von Beckerath concludes by examining the influence of governments on industry, and observes that much social legislation and government regulation benefit business and leave industry to operate in an essentially capitalistic manner. He believes it most improbable that private industrialism will develop into socialism. This book is especially timely for Americans because of the unintended insight it gives into the NRA program, which appears in considerable part to be a transition from trade-association cooperation, for promoting business interests, to outright cartelization.

Films

"Night Flight"

IN "Night Flight" (Capitol) Clarence Brown had an excellent opportunity to turn out the kind of picture that this column is continually demanding but all too rarely able to announce to its readers. In the first place, Saint-Exupéry's novel, although written in a pretty subjective manner throughout, was full of the right kind of movement for the screen. By this, needless to say, one means the movement of men and things in space: "Night Flight" was an account of the perils, sufferings, and triumphs of the first air-mail fliers in South America to risk the dangerous crossing of the Andes by night. In the second place, Saint-Exupéry's book was an attempt to elevate action, or the life of action, to a kind of poetic ecstasy. Action, that is to say, was not only its subject but also its theme. It was a product of that school of contemporary romanticism which seeks a release from the intellectual and psychological problems of the time in one or another mode of unreflecting action. (It may be recalled that it was another Frenchman, Henry de Montherlant, and not Mr. Hemingway, who first pointed out for us the delights of bullfighting.) The impulse behind this school is of course the perennial impulse of escape—that impulse which has always most naturally symbolized itself in the act of flight and which is perhaps most poignantly expressed in Mallarmé's well-known "Fuir, là-bas fuir!" If in Saint-Exupéry's novels the *là-bas* is changed to *là-haut* it is simply because with aviation man's desire to flee somewhere, anywhere, has at last been concretely realized. We can no longer distinguish between flight as impulse and flight as symbol—the two have become one and the same thing. The desire for flight, therefore, can no longer be described merely as a romantic impulse. In Saint-Exupéry it leads to a kind of pure mysticism of action—action which is its own end, which needs no justification, and which reaffirms many of the lost nobilities. The only trouble is that this mysticism, probably because it *is* so new and pure, finds a certain difficulty in getting itself properly communicated. Saint-Exupéry's novel is poetic enough, to be sure, but in a style that is compounded of too many outworn literary clichés and rhetorical mannerisms. What was needed was a newer and more appropriate language to communicate an attitude which was essentially a protest against the old rhetoric and tradition.

As far as its simpler elements are concerned, Clarence Brown has done very well by his exciting text. The take-offs, the first night flights, the fierce strain of flying blind through fog and storm are all rendered with a thrilling persuasiveness. But there is not, unfortunately, enough respect paid to Saint-Exupéry's theme. It is true that Robert Montgomery, after a hard landing, is permitted a few desperate remarks on the subject of life and duty before retiring to an upstairs bordello.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And there is also the fine sequence in which Clark Gable, after being lost for many hours over the sea, suddenly emerges from the clouds into the rediscovered sunlight. Something of the exaltation that Saint-Exupéry was trying to get into words is here more successfully realized by the camera. In general, however, the photography is unenterprising—an exception must be made perhaps for the manner in which the electric bulbs on the manager's chart are made to dissolve into shots of the fliers over the mountains or sea. How far the emphasis of the book is lost may be seen in the attempt to make up a little for a possibly too exclusive "male appeal" by building up sentimental interest in the aviators' wives (Myrna Loy and Helen Hayes). In the novel, of course, love is an impurity which must either be entirely cleansed away or reduced to a very small place indeed in the lives of these ascetics of the air. By playing it up in conventional fashion the producers merely add confusion to sentimentality: our most fundamental reason for being disappointed in "Night Flight," therefore, becomes its lack of concentration.

The latest vehicle of Charles Laughton is an obvious but sometimes coarsely amusing burlesque entitled "The Private Life of Henry VIII" (Music Hall). Except for Mr. Laughton's leering, raving, belching performance, which is all a great deal overdone, there is little to recommend in this importation from the British studios. It will nevertheless prove very popular with that wide audience which prefers its bawdiness in costume.

WILLIAM TROY

Drama

In Praise of Bundling

THE idea behind "The Pursuit of Happiness" (Avon Theater) is so obviously a good one that we can only wonder that it has not been used before. What is more characteristically American of the best colonial period than the pleasant old custom of bundling, and what could possibly lend itself better to the requirements of the modern writer who would like to pay his respects to the past without finding himself compelled to deal sympathetically with those puritanical austerities which no modern audience is likely to contemplate with enthusiasm?

We know, of course, that bundling had its economic justification in the fact that the winters were cold and the firewood scarce. We know, still further, that the man and the maid were supposed to be separated by a wooden centerboard which was half a genuine barrier and half merely a symbol, like the naked sword which the knight *sans reproche* was accustomed to place between himself and any lady with whom the exigencies of medieval housekeeping rather than the working of profane love had bedded him for the night. But the Puritan Fathers had to be fathers of children before they could be fathers of a country, and we like to think that the more human among them were secretly not sorry that the thrifty desire to save fuel during the necessarily long hours of courtship justified what must have been a pleasant custom and solved the problem of providing an opportunity for those amorous preliminaries in the interests of which less forthright cultures invented the kissing game and our own contemporaries discovered the uncertain privacy of a parked automobile.

Gibbon tells us that the more fanatical of the early converts to Christianity used to go to bed together just to prove how completely they had conquered the flesh. This was a mere perversion, and it is not surprising to learn that, in his words, "outraged nature often reasserted herself." But bundling was

PLAYS □ FILMS □ BALL

THE THEATRE GUILD *presents*
EUGENE O'NEILL'S new play
AH, WILDERNESS!
with GEORGE M. COHAN
GUILD THEATRE Fifty-second Street West of Broadway
Eves. 8:20—Mats. Thurs. and Sat. 2:20

THE THEATRE GUILD *presents*
MOLIERE'S COMEDY WITH MUSIC
The SCHOOL for HUSBANDS
Adapted in rhyme by Arthur Guiterman and Lawrence Langner
Music by Edmond W. Rickett
EMPIRE THEATRE BROADWAY AND 40th STREET
Eves. 8:30. Mats. Thurs. & Sat., 2:30

The Group Theatre and Sidney Harmon and James R. Ullman present Sidney Kingsley's play
MEN IN WHITE
An experience thrilling and absorbing, genuine and complete.—*J. W. KRUTCH, The Nation.*
BROADHURST THEATRE—44th St. W. of Broadway
Eves. 50c to $2.50. Mats. Wed. & Sat.

"The PURSUIT of HAPPINESS"
"Merry mixture of folklore and farce."
—*John Mason Brown, Eve. Post.*
"A smart and bawdy satire . . . a wolf in sheep's clothing."
—*Percy Hammond, Herald Tribune.*
AVON THEATRE, 45th Street West of Broadway. CHi. 4-7860.
Eves. 8:45, $1 to $2.50; Mats. Thurs. & Sat. 2:30, 75c & $2.

Rene Clair's
SUCCESSOR TO "SOUS LES TOITS DE PARIS"—
"July 14"
("Quatorze Juillet")
Little CARNEGIE PLAYHOUSE
57th Street East of 7th Avenue
Continuous—Popular Prices

Every Parent, Every Teacher, Every Guardian, Should See this Picture!
BEGINNING THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19th
"The Red-Head" ("Poil de Carotte")
A STORY OF ADOLESCENCE
Dialogue in French—English Subtitles
ACME THEATRE 14th ST. and UNION SQ.
Midnight Show Every Saturday
Rendezvous of the Intelligentsia

DANCE WITH THE STARS at the COSTUME
THEATRE BALL
WEBSTER HALL—119 E. 11th ST.
SATURDAY, NOV. 4 (Dancing till 3 A. M.)
W. C. HANDY—KING OF JAZZ
BENEFIT THEATRE UNION
104 FIFTH AVE.—ALgonquin 4-6093
Ticket in advance $1—at door $1.50. Reserved boxes
SURPRISE AT MIDNIGHT
Tickets on sale at: Theatre Union, 104 Fifth Avenue; Drama Bookshop, 48 W. 52nd Street; Rand Book Store, 7 E. 15th Street; Workers Bookshop, 50 E. 13th Street.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

based frankly upon the expectation that a not too violently outraged nature would reassert itself to the decent extent of calling in a clergyman of the vicinity, and even if he was occasionally called a trifle too late by young people who hesitated to arouse him in the middle of the night for the sake of pure form, the ill was often not serious in a community where the church still had the power to make things right. Perhaps, indeed, the Puritans solved as well as it has ever been solved since the problem raised by the psychologists who maintain that young couples should get to know each other before marriage, and by the protests of the moralists who feel that, though there may be something in the contention, they should not, nevertheless, know one another *too* well. Perhaps, in fine, that degree of knowledge compatible with a complete costume and a centerboard is just about right.

Something of the sort seems, in any event, to be the impression which Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Langner intend to convey in their pleasantly unpretentious little comedy. The scene is laid in Connecticut at the time of the Revolution. The heroine is the daughter of a pious mother and not too pious father; the hero, a handsome young Hessian who deserts his regiment because he is delighted by that sentence in the Declaration of Independence which declares for all the right, not only to life and liberty, but to the "running after happiness." This last character, delightfully played by a young German newcomer named Tonio Selwart, discovers that most Americans are not inclined to take too literally these phrases of the Declaration. He also finds some contradiction between them and the power exercised in New England by the clergy. But bundling reconciles him to everything, and he concludes with the opinion which it is obviously the purpose of the play to enforce—namely, that the America of 1777 was a rather agreeable place where the fanaticism of the Puritan was nicely tempered by the workings of unregenerate human nature. As for me, I was especially pleased by the foreigner's translation of "pursuit of happiness" into "running after happiness." No one can complain that it is not accurate, but if the authors of the Declaration had only used the more colloquial phrase there might have been less doubt then and now that they really meant what they said. "The Pursuit of Happiness" seems destined for success.

"Her Man of Wax" (Shubert Theater) is from the German of Walter Hasenclever, but it appears to have been so thoroughly "adapted" as to have lost whatever meaning it may once have had. The original was probably a satiric fantasy—more or less after the fashion of "Wings over Europe" or "The Miracle at Verdun"—in the course of which Napoleon comes to life in the Musée Grévin, is forced against his will to assume control of the French army, and then returns to wax when, for reasons rather obscure in the present version, he decides that the task of remaking Europe is hopeless. As presented here, the play becomes a vehicle for Miss Lenore Ulric, whose talents, it will be remembered, are not primarily political, and the big scene is that in which she rolls from the bed on to the floor in amorous transport. So much time is given over to these antics that very little remains in which to transact what was presumably the chief business of the play. Indeed, it is impossible to guess what the point was intended to be. At the waxworks Napoleon is hailed by Landru as a distinguished murderer like himself, and one gathers that the author is out to preach against the folly of fighting for peace. At other moments there is much talk about the world's need of a strong man and there emerges what appears to be a sort of fascist propaganda. The only thing which remains completely clear is the fact that Napoleon was much taken by Miss Ulric and that she returned his passion with pleasing abandon. I fear, however, that "Her Man of Wax" is not very satisfactory as either political satire or bedroom farce.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Contributors to This Issue

PAUL BLANSHARD is the executive director of the City Affairs Committee of New York.

S. FITZ-RANDOLPH is the author of "The Airplane Leads a Double Life."

H. PHILLIPS is the compiler and owner of a large aeronautical library in Washington, D. C.

PAUL Y. ANDERSON is a Washington correspondent of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*.

CARL M. MYDANS is a member of the editorial staff of the *American Banker*.

W. B. YEATS is the well-known Irish poet.

H. L. MENCKEN has recently announced his retirement as editor of the *American Mercury*.

LIONEL TRILLING is a member of the English department of Columbia University.

CATHERINE BAUER is preparing a book on modern European housing, which will be published in the near future.

ALICE BEAL PARSONS is the author of "John Merrill's Pleasant Life."

□ JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH says □

AH, WILDERNESS. Guild Theater. Delightful sentimental comedy of Youth, written by Eugene O'Neill, although it doesn't seem to have been.

AS THOUSANDS CHEER. Music Box. Hard-hitting musical satire of current events, with Clifton Webb, Helen Broderick, and Leslie Adams. Best thing of its kind.

CHAMPAGNE, SEC. Morosco Theater. To be reviewed next week.

DOUBLE DOOR. Ritz Theater. An exciting melodrama obviously suggested by the Wendell case.

HEAT LIGHTNING. Booth Theater. Simple but exciting melodrama about two girls and a gas station in the great desert.

HER MAN OF WAX. Shubert Theater. Reviewed in this issue.

HOLD YOUR HORSES. Winter Garden. Amiable madness with Joe Cook.

KEEPER OF THE KEYS. Fulton Theater. To be reviewed later.

LET 'EM EAT CAKE. Imperial Theater. To be reviewed later.

MEN IN WHITE. Broadhurst Theater. Extraordinary production of an extraordinary play.

MURDER AT THE VANITIES. New Amsterdam. Unholy mixture of absurd melodrama and routine revue. Nevertheless a big success.

ONE SUNDAY AFTERNOON. 48th Street Theater. Pleasant little play held over from last season.

PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS. Avon Theater. Reviewed in this issue.

THE GREEN BAY TREE. Cort Theatre. To be reviewed later.

THE SCHOOL FOR HUSBANDS. Empire Theater. To be reviewed next week.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED